



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2004

No. 2

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 21, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB SIMMONS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, creator of life, author of our inalienable rights, every single human person is to be valued and revered. Some people in life mean more to us than others. In this Nation, the office of Presidency bestows upon a single person an awesome responsibility. The President personifies our loyalty and our strength as a Nation. He is called to unify our diversity and resources for the lasting good of this country and for the betterment of the world community.

Today we pray for George W. Bush, the 43rd President of the United States of America. Bless him, his cabinet, staff advisors, and especially his family. Be his source of wisdom and planning and of understanding the people's needs and courage in difficult times.

May all in the executive branch of government work in cooperation with this Congress to achieve what is best for our Nation at this time. This we ask in Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELAURO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PRESIDENT BUSH LEADS EFFECTIVELY, HONORABLY, AND WITH DISTINCTION

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I see there are a few Democrats on the floor today; they are busy preparing their "I hate George Bush" speeches for the day. We finished last night with a message from the President of the United States about the hopeful optimism this country has and the things that we can do together if we only stop bickering and start working towards our common goals.

The war on terrorism is his single focus; and since September 11, our homeland has been safe. Liberating the world has been his hallmark, and today we can claim that Libya is now negotiating with the United States. North Korea is finally talking about putting aside their hatefulness. India and Pakistan are joining together for conversations that are hopeful and helpful for solving the world's problems.

This President has led effectively, honorably, and with distinction.

At the end of the State of the Union speech, the minority leader went on to

describe how reckless, basically, this President has been. I disagree vehemently and strongly. I applaud our President. I applaud the state of the Union. The economy is growing stronger, unemployment is reducing itself and we are finding ourselves in a better place, thanks to his leadership.

God bless this great Nation and, as the chaplain said, God bless our President.

HONORING MICHAEL GALE

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael Gale, an exceptional student in my district in West Virginia, and one of my constituents.

Michael was recently awarded one of 12 George Mitchell Scholarships for postgraduate studies at universities in Ireland and Northern Ireland. Michael is the first West Virginia resident ever to receive this prestigious award and will study at the National University of Ireland in Galway.

The Mitchell Scholarship was established by an endowment from the Irish Government in 1998 and is administered by the U.S.-Ireland Alliance. The House has supported funding for the Mitchell Scholarship both in 2003 and 2004. The British Government also provides support for this program.

I offer my congratulations to Michael Gale, an exceptional young West Virginian, and the other 11 winners of the Mitchell Scholarship and wish them all the best in their studies in Ireland.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAROLD J. "TEX" LEZAR, JUNIOR

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty this morning to report on the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H39

passing of one of the most articulate conservative voices in Texas.

Harold J. "Tex" Lezar, Jr., left us earlier this month, a Texas lawyer who had worked for both the Nixon and Reagan administrations and was a fixture in Texas and national politics.

Born in Dallas, Tex Lezar grew up in Japan, the son of a ship's captain who did reconnaissance work for General MacArthur. He graduated from Yale and was an assistant to columnist William F. Buckley, Jr., before becoming a speech writer for President Nixon. Tex worked on Ronald Reagan's 1980 Presidential campaign before becoming a special counsel to the U.S. Attorney General and later the chief of staff under Attorney General William French Smith.

In June of 1984, Tex Lezar married Ms. Mary Spaeth. He leaves three children: Philip, Beau, and Maverick.

As a Texas Republican, I can say we were blessed to have had him with us as a guide to encourage and direct our political paths. As a friend of him and his family, I am glad I had the chance to know him; and I honor his life here today.

COMMENDING DR. GEORGE MEETZE FOR HIS HISTORIC SERVICE TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week history was made in the South Carolina State Senate when the Reverend George Elias Meetze presented the prayer for opening the Senate First Day of the Second Session of the 115th General Assembly on January 13. This marked the 55th year of service by the enthusiastic Dr. Meetze as chaplain of the Senate. He holds the historic record of being the longest-serving chaplain of a legislative body in the world. Every day, as he leads the Senate in prayer, he establishes a new record of devotion to the people of South Carolina.

Dr. Meetze is a graduate of the University of South Carolina, New York Theological Seminary, and Lutheran Southern Seminary. He is the retired pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Incarnation of Columbia from 1942 to 1974. Dr. Meetze and his late wife, Margaret Allen, have two sons, George Allen Meetze and William Dagnall Meetze.

In every way, Dr. Meetze is a vital participant of the Midlands community, never missing Rotary, promoting the Salvation Army, and serving the American Cancer Society.

I urge my colleagues to commend Dr. George Meetze for his historic service as he begins a new session.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. We will always remember September 11.

HEALTH CARE VOUCHERS FOR THE WORKING UNINSURED

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last year, Americans on average saw their health care costs increase by 9.3 percent. That is on top of the year before where health care inflation ran at 12 percent. Today, we have 44 million Americans without health insurance and 32 million Americans who work full-time without health care.

In fact, the problem with our health care system today is that many people with health care insurance pay an uninsured premium for those who work, but show up at emergency rooms without health care. Hospital costs are skyrocketing through the roof. We all pay for their health care, and they do not get it.

What ails our health care system is that there is not enough competition. We need competition in pricing of prescription drugs where we have competition, where people can buy drugs in Canada, in Europe. That competition and choice would drive prices down. What we need to do for the uninsured is also create a competitive system.

I have offered and will be offering soon a piece of legislation for a health care voucher for the working uninsured where they will get a voucher equal to the dollar amount of the tax credit the President proposed and buy into a subsidiary of the Federal employees health care plan.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 492) honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 492

Whereas America's Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, but provide students more than a superior scholastic education;

Whereas Catholic schools ensure a broad, values-added education emphasizing the life-long development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in America's young people;

Whereas the total Catholic school student enrollment for the 2003-2004 academic year is 2,600,000 and the student-teacher ratio is 17 to 1;

Whereas Catholic schools teach a diverse group of students;

Whereas more than 26 percent of school children enrolled in Catholic schools are from minority backgrounds, and more than 14 percent are non-Catholics;

Whereas Catholic schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in spiritual, character, and moral development;

Whereas in the 1972 pastoral message concerning Catholic education, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops stated: "Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny, but also the destinies of the many communities in which he lives."; and

Whereas January 25-31, 2004, has been designated as Catholic Schools Week by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, an event celebrating its 30th year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, an event co-sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and established to recognize the vital contributions of America's thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools; and

(2) congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 492.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 492, offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER). This resolution honors the contributions of America's Catholic schools, which are dedicated to not only educating their students academically but to developing their moral, intellectual, physical, and social values.

January 25 through the 31 is Catholic Schools Week, an annual tradition jointly sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, and it is in its 30th year.

The purpose of this resolution and Catholic Schools Week is to celebrate the vital role that Catholic elementary and secondary schools play as they provide a values-added education with high standards of quality and excellence to many of America's children.

As President George W. Bush noted earlier this month in recognition of the National Catholic Education Association's 100th anniversary, "Catholic educators share the basic conviction that every child can learn," a principle that we are extending to public education through the No Child Left Behind Act.

The President also pointed out that high expectations that characterize Catholic education have provided students with overwhelming results. More than 99 percent of students participating in Catholic education graduate from high school and the majority of those go on to college.

As a product of Catholic education from elementary school through my education at Xavier University, I have found that my foundation in Catholic education has helped me strengthen my sense of purpose in life and prepare me to achieve my goals. My home State of Ohio has more than 500 Catholic schools, including my alma mater, Moeller High School. In Ohio, the Catholic schools serve more than 180,000 students, including more than 56,000 students attending 135 Catholic schools in the archdiocese of Cincinnati that is part of my district.

I appreciate the great work being done by Catholic schools, their administrators and teachers, as well as their parents and volunteers. And as the President noted earlier this month, "Catholic schools carry out a great mission, to serve God by building the knowledge and character of young people." I commend my colleague from Louisiana for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I am pleased to join the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) in support of this resolution.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for introducing this resolution as we recognize the diversity of our educational systems throughout the country. Today's resolution recognizes the contribution of Catholic schools. Mr. Speaker, children all across America have benefited from Catholic education. Certainly we can all agree that Catholic schools are a strong and positive force in America's educational system.

Fortunately, the great, truly great aspect of America's education system is its diversity. The goal of our system should be both public and private, and it is to provide anyone and everyone in any city, any State with the opportunity they need to succeed.

□ 1015

The educational recipe for success in our country certainly includes Catholic schools, schools with other religious focuses and non-religious private schools, along with our public schools which means so much to so many. It is this variety, this diversity that truly makes American education powerful. It makes American education successful in its mission.

Today we recognize Catholic schools for their long commitment to education, to a value system, to developing the kind of lifestyles that students as well as adults need to seek.

There are many outstanding Catholic schools in my Congressional district. Among them Fenwick High School in Oak Park, Illinois, Resurrection Elementary Schools in Chicago, and, of course, St. Ignatius Prep, which is recognized as one of the top prep schools in the Nation.

So I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) in supporting this resolution, commend him for his insight.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the chairman of one of our subcommittees of the Committee on Education.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 492, which recognizes Catholic Schools Week and honors Catholic schools for the important role that they play in educating America's children.

Catholic schools will provide a high quality and innovative education for over 2.5 million students this year, serving a diverse group of students from many social and economic backgrounds. Catholic schools educate racially and ethnically diverse students, children who live in inner cities, urban and rural communities, children who are not Catholic, and even students with disabilities.

These schools excel not only in bringing students with different needs and backgrounds, but they also graduate 99 percent of their student population and send 97 percent of their student body to post-secondary institutions of higher education.

This academic excellence is coupled with very low per-pupil expenditures which stems from the Catholic Church's willingness and commitment to invest in students and in local communities. Over 84 percent of Catholic schools provide tuition assistance to their students to enable low income parents to send their children to these high-achieving schools.

Catholic schools have demonstrated a commitment to teaching every child believing that each child can and will learn. When school choice initiatives have become the law in States and communities across the country, Catholic schools have opened their

arms and their doors to parents and children seeking alternative educational options.

My home State of Michigan has the ninth largest Catholic school enrollment in the country, with 320 Catholic schools educating more than 88,000 students through preschools, elementary schools, middle schools, high schools and after-school programs. In my Congressional district, I have many large and small Catholic schools in urban and rural communities, some schools that specialize in elementary educations and others that educate students during their middle school and high school years.

Catholic schools are widely recognized for their academic distinction. However, I am proud to praise their achievement in meeting the needs of the entire student. Catholic schools build character in our young people and seek to educate the spiritual, intellectual, social, and cultural components of each person while developing an attitude of servant leadership among their students.

Through their insistence on teaching children values, Catholic schools challenge students to live moral and compassionate lives. By insisting on high academic standards and innovative teaching methods, Catholic schools are models of academic excellence for all teachers and schools in this Nation.

I join my colleagues in recognizing Catholic schools week and in congratulating the schools, students, parents and teachers in West Michigan and throughout the Nation for their ongoing commitment to a high-quality education for all of our children.

I would also like to thank the Catholic educational system for the fine work that they did in shaping our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the Democratic Whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution, of course, notwithstanding the most recent information I have received from our colleague. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for bringing it to the floor.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

CARLTON R. SICKLES, A TRUE PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, a former colleague of our ours died last Saturday morning. He was an extraordinarily good human being and a very close friend. I want to pay tribute to a good and decent American, an absolutely wonderful individual, Carlton R. Sickles, who passed away early Saturday.

It is unfortunate that millions of people whose lives he touched during his 82 years never had the benefit of knowing him personally. I am blessed as many in this body were blessed by knowing him well. He was a veteran of

World War II and the Korean War, a former Maryland legislator, a gubernatorial candidate and a Member of the House from 1963 to 1967.

But he is perhaps best known, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who live in the Washington metropolitan area as the father of the Metrorail transit system which today serves millions of customers every single year, not only those who live in this region but those millions of people who come to the Washington metropolitan area to visit their Capitol and their Representatives.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, I will forever be indebted to Carlton for encouraging me to choose a career in public service. I wanted to run for the House of Delegates in 1966. He was running for governor. He urged me to run for the State Senate. I did not think I could win a State Senate seat. I was 2 months out of law school and thought that premature, but he continued to encourage me. And the third time he asked I ran, and I was fortunate enough to be successful. That has made a huge difference in my life.

He encouraged so many others to participate in public service. His own public service was a credit to elective office, a credit to this institution, a credit to Maryland, and his community.

To his wife Jacqueline, his children, and all his family, I offer my deepest condolences. Carlton was a role model who left a tremendous legacy. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for bringing in resolution to the floor and to my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), hopefully our next Senator from the great State of Louisiana, for proclaiming the importance of Catholic parochial education in our society and in our lives.

As a product of Sacred Heart School in Lake Worth, I remembered returning to that very classroom where the shock of my life at that time had been the assassination of President John Kennedy. We were in 4th grade. We were asked to pray and pray for our nation and for our assassinated president.

And after September 11th when I was equally shocked as the Nation was watching in horror the events unfolding in New York City, I returned that classroom for solace, for comfort, and for guidance.

Catholic education was a lot to me and to our family. My father started at Sacred Heart himself as a teacher, went on to Cardinal Newman to be a coach and earth science teacher, and then went on to the public school system where he retired from a school for troubled children.

Through his leadership and our parents' guidance and the church's blessing, it has meant a lot to all of our family as we learned life's lessons.

I recently attended St. Ann's school in West Palm Beach. Their students undertook on their own initiative an effort to send memorabilia and messages to our troops in Iraq. They gathered and worked together to do handiworks and crafts and essential items, care packages, if you will, to our troops only to find that nobody would take the packages. Not UPS, did not fly there, not FedEx. There was no way to get all of their hard work accomplished. They called our office. Thanks to the hard work of our staff, they repacked the boxes, asked the Department of Defense for permission and were able to load those packages on to a flight heading to Iraq.

I recently went to the school and thanked the children for their extraordinary efforts and thinking of our troops first over the holiday period. And they read for me a number of the letters that were sent back by our personnel in the field. It was heartwarming to see the interaction between soldier and student.

Ave Maria is a new university contemplated and soon to be constructed in Ft. Myers, Florida, the first Catholic university to be built in the country in 40 years. I commend our community for being lucky to have a Catholic University soon in our presence.

Catholic schools are important to the fiber and foundation of our Nation. They give every child a chance to pray in class, which is a unique and novel thing, one I welcome and urge other non-parochial schools to participate in. Because, after all, after September 11th the one thing that lifted the soul of the Nation and gave us courage to fight on in the days ahead was, in fact, our collective prayer, our willingness and wishes for a better world for all Americans and all inhabitants of the world.

So I salute the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman, and all who will join with us today in, again, saluting the importance of Catholic education in our daily lives.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the author of the resolution that we are considering.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, thanks for the opportunity to recognize today the contributions of Catholic schools. It is particularly significant for me and my constituents since Catholic education began in America in my home State of Louisiana in 1725. My wife Wendy and I are both Catholic school graduates. We send our kids to the Catholic school right in our neighborhood. We know first-hand those contributions as so many speakers before me have noted.

Catholic schools prepare every student to meet the challenges of their future by developing their mind, yes, but also their body and their soul and spir-

it. They instill students with self-confidence and motivation and the will to succeed, and they provide a true education of value in every sense of the term.

This year is the 30th anniversary of Catholic schools week. The week was established to recognize the vital contributions of America's thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

The schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities. And those students are very well rounded and they come from truly diverse backgrounds. Nationally non-Catholic enrollment in Catholic schools is 13 percent and minority enrollment is 26 percent. So the institutions are rich both in tradition and diversity.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to honor the faculty who dedicate their lives to shaping the future of their students, and certainly that includes the religious who are at the core of Catholic education. I salute the parents who sacrifice their personal funds to send their children to Catholic schools. I applaud the students of those schools for the role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for this Nation.

And I join with so many of my colleagues in saluting this vital part of American education.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just indicate again that I strongly support this resolution for a number of reasons. We all know that Catholic schools are noted for a strong emphasis on discipline, which is so important for young people. As a matter of fact, important for all of us. They are noted for a strong emphasis on values education, values that we all need to internalize and make a part of our every day lives.

They are also noted for parental involvement. Catholic schools' parents must be involved in the education of their children. All schools should follow this concept because without parental involvement, then children do not really get the information that they need to have to know that education is not just inside the school, but it is an actual part of life.

And so, again, I commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) for introducing this resolution. I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and others in support of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues who have come to the floor today to help us celebrate Catholic Schools Week. As I said, not only am I a graduate of Catholic education, but so are my 11 brothers and sisters. If it were not for the commitment of my parents to send us to Catholic schools,

I do not think that we would be what we are today.

□ 1030

I cannot really go on much further in talking about Catholic education without admiring the work of Cardinal McCarrick here in Washington, D.C.

While there are many Catholic schools here in Washington, there are 13 very special Catholic schools here in Washington called the Consortium Schools that are in low-income neighborhoods. They are 95 percent minority, 80 percent non-Catholic. Cardinal McCarrick and the volunteers at the consortium have worked to keep those 13 schools open for the benefit of those children in those neighborhoods.

Last year, Senator KENNEDY and I worked to help raise money to keep these 13 schools open. I made a commitment to go see all 13. I made it to four. I have got nine more to go. But there is amazing work that is going on at these 13 schools here in Washington where we all know the condition of the public schools. I just want to take a moment to thank Cardinal McCarrick and those at the City Consortium Schools for the work they are doing to help minority and poor children here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased that Congress has recognized the important role that Catholic Schools play in our community.

As a Latino, I know the important place that Catholic education has had in my district. The Saint Thomas Aquinas High School in San Bernardino, CA, is highly regarded for its academic and athletic excellence.

The San Bernardino Diocese School System under Bishop Gerald Barnes has made major investments into their school system to bring students into the 21st century.

Even though I am a strong supporter of public schools, I understand the importance of Catholic schools in our Nation's education and the values they instill in our students.

The quality of education provided at Catholic schools is truly remarkable, and deserving of high honors.

Not only do they focus on academic achievement but they also build strong moral foundations for young people. Their curriculums are often full of programs in character development and community service.

Catholic school students graduate with a wide variety of skills that will not only help them in their careers but also in their family and community life.

I am please to support this resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of House Resolution 492, offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER. This resolution honors the contributions of America's Catholic schools, and their dedication to educating their students and improving their communities.

Catholic Schools Week 2004 will be celebrated from January 25–31 with the theme, "Catholic Schools: A Faith-Filled Future." Every year since 1974 Catholic Schools Week has been celebrated and jointly sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, but provide students more than a quality academic education. Catholic schools provide a values-infused education that emphasizes moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in America's young people. In turn these schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities.

There are currently over 2.6 million students enrolled in 8,000 Catholic schools across this Nation. In my home State of Delaware, over 30 Catholic schools provide an excellent education to over 15,000 students. These schools serve children from all incomes and backgrounds. In addition, Catholic school students come from many different races, religions, and ethnicities. In this school year, about 26 percent of Catholic school students are from minority backgrounds and about 14 percent are not Catholic.

I appreciate the great work being done by the Catholic schools, their administrators and teachers as well as their parents and volunteers. I commend my colleague from Louisiana for introducing this resolution and urge my colleagues to support it.

Archmere Academy, Claymont
Christ Our King School, Wilmington
Corpus Christi School, Wilmington
Holy Angels Elementary School, Newark
Holy Cross School, Dover
Holy Rosary Elementary School, Claymont
Holy Spirit Elementary School, New Castle
Immaculate Heart Of Mary School, Wilmington
Mother of Divine Grace
Mother Seton School
Our Lady Of Fatima School, New Castle
Our Lady of Grace Kindergarten, Newark
Padua Academy, Wilmington
Sacred Heart Academy
Saint Ann Elementary School, Wilmington
Saint Anthony Of Padua School, Wilmington
Saint Catherine Of Siena School, Wilmington
Saint Edmond's Academy School, Wilmington
Saint Elizabeth Elementary School, Wilmington
Saint Elizabeth High School, Wilmington
Saint Hedwig Elementary School, Wilmington
Saint Helena Elementary School, Wilmington
Saint John Bosco's Academy
Saint John The Beloved School, Wilmington
Saint Joseph's Academy
Saint Marks High School, Wilmington
Saint Mary Magdalen School, Wilmington
Saint Matthew Elementary School, Wilmington
Saint Paul Elementary School, Wilmington
Saint Peter School, New Castle
Saint Peters Cathedral School, Wilmington
Saints Peter and Paul School of Easton
Saint Thomas More Academy, Magnolia
Saint Thomas The Apostle School, Wilmington
Saint Vincent's Academy
Salesianum School, Wilmington
Ursuline Academy of Wilmington
Windermere Place

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 492 and in recognition of the numerous contributions that Catholic schools bring to our country. The standard of academic excellence promoted in the thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools around the nation provide a vital contribution to the fabric of our educational system.

Year-round, these institutions provide a solid, structured education to our young peo-

ple that is steeped in the traditions of the Catholic church. Today, we congratulate Catholic schools, parents, and teachers for their ongoing contributions and their key role in ensuring a brighter, more promising future for the more than 2.5 million students who attend these schools. We also recognize the particular contribution of Catholic schools to our country's minority population. Nationwide, Catholic schools have a minority enrollment of 26 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to every individual in our country who dedicates themselves to educating our children. I am proud to recognize today the unique contribution of America's Catholic Schools, and specifically, the great work of South Florida Catholic schools in educating the children of South Florida.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, because I am attending the important World Economic Conference in Davos, Switzerland, at which I intend to argue strongly for changes in international economic policy better to reflect the rights of working people and the importance of environmental protection, I am missing some votes in suspension. By their nature of course, bills scheduled this early in the session on the suspension calendar are entirely non-controversial so my inability to vote on some of them, while regrettable, was obviously irrelevant to the outcome. What my absence does mean is the lack of a chance to express my support for various of the principles affirmed in those resolutions, so I want to take this opportunity to express my agreement with their thrust. In particular, given the importance of Catholic schools in the district I am privileged to represent, I want to express my appreciation for the dedicated and effective work done by the educators in that school system whose commitment to young people is one of the great assets our society has. I am happy to be able to join my colleagues in expressing my gratitude to those dedicated men and women who devote themselves to the job of educating young people in an appropriate way.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as we strive for excellence in America's schools, I am pleased to honor next week as Catholic Schools Week.

Catholic schools provide an intellectually stimulating environment, one where children are challenged by their peers and teachers to make the most of their education. Children from many nationalities and religious backgrounds attend Catholic Schools across America, and all learn the basic principles and values necessary to achieve the American Dream.

Catholic Schools emphasize the importance and development of faith and character. Teachers and staff nurture students in a professional and caring manner encouraging spiritual and emotional growth through education and community involvement.

Receiving a quality education has always been of great importance for our country as we reach to make the future bright for generations to come, and Catholic schools have and will continue to make a huge impact on our nation's youth.

I am pleased to offer my support for H. Res. 492, the Designation of Catholic Schools week, and thank my colleague Representative DAVID VITTER of Louisiana for bringing this important issue to the floor and to the attention of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 492.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING MENTORS AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO RECRUIT MENTORS

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 491) honoring individuals who are mentors and supporting efforts to recruit more mentors.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 491

Whereas mentoring is a strategy for motivating and helping young people succeed in life by bringing them together in structured and trusting relationships with caring adults who provide guidance, support, and encouragement;

Whereas mentoring offers a supportive environment in which young people can grow, expand their vision, learn necessary skills, and achieve a future that they may never have thought possible;

Whereas a growing body of research shows that mentoring benefits young people in numerous ways, including improvements in school performance and attendance, self-confidence, attitudes toward and relationships with adults, and motivation to reach their potential;

Whereas mentoring is an adaptable, flexible approach that can be tailored to help children with academics, social support, career preparation, or leadership development;

Whereas there is in this Nation a mentoring gap, consisting of over 15,000,000 young people who need mentors but do not have them;

Whereas, in an effort to begin closing the mentoring gap, the House of Representatives on December 8, 2003, approved a measure to significantly increase Federal grant funding for local mentoring organizations to \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

Whereas the recipients of those grants and other mentoring programs all across the country rely principally on volunteer mentors and will need an influx of volunteers to meet the growing demand for mentoring;

Whereas nonprofit groups and leading media companies have joined together to designate January 2004 as National Mentoring Month in an effort to recruit more mentors for young people;

Whereas the monthlong celebration of mentoring will encourage more adults to volunteer their time as mentors for young people and will enlist the involvement of nonprofit organizations, schools, businesses, faith communities, and government agencies in the mentoring movement; and

Whereas on January 9, 2004, President George W. Bush signed a proclamation designating January 2004 as National Mentoring Month and called upon the people of the United States to recognize the importance of being role models for youth, to look for mentoring opportunities in their communities, and to celebrate this month with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) praises those individuals who have already given their time to mentor a child; and

(2) supports efforts to recruit more mentors in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 491.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the National Mentoring Month Resolution honoring those who give their time to mentor children.

Last night in this Chamber the President emphasized the threat of terrorism to our Nation's security, and I think all of us are aware of that threat. I would like to make a point that the major threat to our Nation's survival, as I see it, is not terrorism, as much of a threat as this is; but, rather, it is the trauma and dysfunction that is faced by so many of our children, because they are the future of this country.

Currently, roughly 50 percent of our young people are growing up without both biological parents. We have 20 million fatherless children in our Nation. I used to work with some of those young people. And when your father does not care enough about you to stay around to even see what you look like, it leaves a hole in your psyche that you are often times trying to fill for the rest of your life and usually filling it with all of the wrong things.

Currently, the United States leads the world in violence for young people: homicide, suicide, so on. We also are certainly very much addicted to drugs, alcohol abuse with teenagers, pornography. These are every day threats that our young people face. So having said all that, mentoring is the best-known remedy that many of us have for the social pathology that is harming our children today which threatens the foundation of our culture and our society.

Let me take a minute or two and mention what a mentor is. Some people hear the term and do not think about it very much. A mentor is someone

who cares. Quite often children have some attention from fathers, mothers, grandparents, teachers and preachers and people who are paid to pay attention to them in some way or another. But a mentor is one who simply cares enough to show up and spend time with a young person and say unconditionally, I, someone who has no ax to grind at all, cares enough about you to show up every week or twice a week or whatever and spend some time and invest my life in your life.

A mentor is also someone who affirms. And I saw in my previous profession of coaching how important affirmation was. So often if you gave the player the message that he was not very good, that he did not measure up, that he was not going to make it, often times his performance would begin to play down to that level of expectation. But on the other hand, if you told him, I really believe in you, I see some promise in you, we think you have a great future, we think down the line you will be a great player, that player often times would perform at a level that he himself was not aware that he could perform at.

So that is essentially what a mentor does. A mentor affirms. He says, I believe in you. I see some potential here. I see some talent.

So many of our young people today have no affirmation in their lives, no one who is affirming who they are, what they are or what they can do.

Lastly, I would say a mentor is one who provides some directions and vision. So many young people are growing up in households today where they really do not have a role model who has shown what it is to get up and go to work every day, someone who takes responsibility, someone who finishes their education or someone who just finishes anything. A mentor is one who can say, I see a future for you beyond dropping out at the end of the tenth grade. I see a future for you beyond minimum-wage jobs, and you have this talent and you can do this.

So mentoring is very important, and I think it is important to realize also that mentoring works. We have currently a great deal of evidence that indicates that mentoring will reduce drug and alcohol abuse by roughly 50 percent, significantly reduces teenage pregnancy, teenage drop-out rates, teenage violence; and it improves self-esteem, grades, and relationships. And so it is the best thing that we have going, considering what our children are facing today.

The other thing to remember is that mentoring is cost effective. It costs roughly \$300 to \$500 to provide a good mentoring experience for a child, and it costs \$25,000 to \$30,000 to lock them up for a year. The average meth addict will commit 64 crimes a year, which is a huge cost to any community. So we feel that mentoring at the front end reduces a great many of the costs at the back end of the social process.

Two years ago, the first Mentoring for Success grants were awarded by the

Department of Education. And to give an idea of how important these grants were, we had roughly 10 times as many applicants as we had grants to award. So that \$17.5 million that was awarded went very quickly and was well spent.

This fiscal year with the President's support, funding for mentoring has been increased in the omnibus bill, if we can get that passed, which includes mentoring for children of prisoners as well. It increases from \$17.5 million to \$100 million. So the President has put a significant emphasis on mentoring, which we think is very important.

The National Mentoring Partnership estimates that 2.5 million children have mentors in our country today, and roughly 17.5 million badly need a mentor. So we are mentoring just about 1 out of 10 that need it. But actually, almost every child could use a mentor. Most every successful person can point to a mentor in their life that has made a huge difference.

Congressional staff members are mentoring. One example is Horton's Kids. I would encourage Members of Congress to encourage their staff members to be active here on the Hill because this provides a great service and a great example. As we celebrate National Mentoring Month through January, I want to commend all who support mentoring by contributing their time and financial resources.

Working together one child at a time, we can make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 20, 2004.

Hon. TOM OSBORNE,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OSBORNE: As President of the American Osteopathic Association (AOA), I am pleased to inform you of our support for your resolution. The AOA, and the 52,000 osteopathic physicians it represents, extends its sincere gratitude to you for your support and advocacy of mentoring programs.

Andrew Taylor Still, M.D., D.O., founder of osteopathic medicine, dedicated his life to improving the health and well-being of his fellow citizens. Through a lifetime of sharing his knowledge and experiences, he shaped the lives of thousands of physicians and provided direction to an entire profession. He was a mentor in the truest sense. Recognizing the significant role of mentors and the contributions they make to enhance the studies and careers of osteopathic physicians, I have made my presidency the Year of the Mentor. Throughout the year, we work to recognize those who have contributed their time and talents to mentoring. In addition, we work to enroll new mentors who will shape the minds and talents of future D.O.s.

Your resolution, celebrating January 2004 as the Month of the Mentor, supports efforts to honor mentors and increase the number of individuals involved in mentoring programs. As evidenced by the lives and careers of those who have been mentored, mentoring positively impacts individuals and communities. As a result of mentoring within the osteopathic profession, beginning with our founder, patients benefit by receiving quality care from physicians who have enhanced their knowledge through the years of learning and experience of their mentors.

On behalf of my fellow osteopathic physicians, I pledge our support for your effort to promote mentoring programs. Please do not hesitate to call upon the AOA or our members for assistance on health care issues. Please contact the AOA's Department of Government Relations at (202) 414-0140 for additional information.

Sincerely,

DARRYL A. BEECHLER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Nebraska for his leadership in bringing this resolution recognizing National Mentoring Month to the floor today. Since he arrived in Congress, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) has worked to make youth issues a priority, and this resolution is another example of his dedication to this effort.

Without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, mentoring is a proven strategy that can change the lives of children and youth, and, I might add, adds additional value to the lives of those who provide the mentoring service.

When a young person is matched with a caring, responsible individual, this relationship makes a positive difference in the quality of life for that young person. For too long we have focused on providing remedies to problems that only address negative behavior rather than looking at ways that promote the positive and healthy development of our young people. This resolution directs us to focus on what children need to grow into healthy, safe, and well-educated adults, making sure that children have access to a caring and responsible adult relationship.

A recent report from the Greater West Town Community Development Project showed that nearly 18 percent of Chicago public school students drop out. Another report from the Annie E. Casey Foundation showed that more than 200,000 Chicago-area children are living in severely distressed neighborhoods. These are among the tens of thousands of Chicago area youth who could dramatically benefit from having a mentor, since without one, some would never be exposed to healthy, productive lifestyles and the development of real-life skills.

Research shows that young people who are mentored had a stronger attachment to school, have higher graduation rates and decreased involvement with drugs and violence. Mentoring opens young people's eyes to a brighter future, and every young person deserves that opportunity. But right now there are simply not enough mentors to go around.

This resolution brings much needed attention to the value of mentoring and encourages communities to focus their efforts on recruiting more adult mentors so that we can fill the gap that currently exists. I am proud of many of the great mentoring programs

that are already in place in Chicago, such as Mercy Home's Friends First program, Sinai Mentoring Program which links Sinai professionals with youth from North and South Lawndale high schools, as well as the involvement of the Chicago Cubs headed by Coach Dusty Baker kicking off the celebration of National Mentoring Month in Chicago last week.

In Chicago and across the country, it is clear that the framework is in place. Now we just need more people to volunteer their time and help change the life of a child. I am very pleased to be associated with many groups and organizations, like the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity, which has a great national mentoring program, and especially my local chapter Mu Mu Lambda. I am also pleased to be associated with the 100 Black Men of America who have mentoring programs in chapters throughout the Nation.

So I want to commend also the Chicago public school system, the board of education, for a program called Cradle to the Classroom where they have mentors who work individually with young parents, students who have become pregnant and who have children and yet have been able to finish their high school education and graduate with the help of a mentor.

So once again I would commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for his insight, dedication, and continuous work with the development of young people as expressed in this resolution. I urge strong support for it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his kind comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, who has been very supportive of mentoring; and we certainly appreciate all he does on the committee.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the sponsor of this resolution for the time and congratulate him for his leadership on the very important issue of mentoring.

□ 1045

As he pointed out very rightly, many children in America need the help and support that many times they do not get at home, and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) has led the efforts over the 3 years that he has been here in Congress to bring our attention to the need for more mentors, and probably no one in the Congress is more qualified to talk about the need for mentors than someone who mentored a young man on the football field for many years.

But beyond his prowess as a coach and mentor of a lot of young men, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr.

OSBORNE) spent much time around his State of Nebraska helping to establish mentoring programs there, and during the years he has been in Congress, has continued his efforts, and I want to congratulate him for all of his work.

Mentors do provide affirmation and a guidepost for many children who do not get affirmation and do not get the kind of guidance that they need. I know in my home State of Ohio we have a program called Ohio Reads. Many schools in my district have grants where it is a mentoring-based program to help children who need help in reading, and many people throughout my community and communities throughout my district and the State mentor in many schools to help young people achieve more proficiency in their reading.

Here in Washington and other cities around America, there is a program called Everybody Wins, and here in Washington, that program involves many staffers here on Capitol Hill and Members who read to children in various schools throughout the city. I am proud that many of my staff, both of my committee staff and my personal staff, are mentors to young people, again trying to help them read and to provide guidance for them.

One of those mentors is my assistant in my office, Amy Hobart, who for 5 years, has read to a young girl at Tyler Elementary School here on Capitol Hill, and the child has her share of problems, but every week, Amy goes over there and spends an hour helping that young lady master her reading skills. But those are just several mere examples of the millions of Americans who do, in fact, volunteer.

The last point that I would make is that many of us as Members, as we go around our districts and around the country, people always ask, well, what can I do, what can I do to help, and everybody in America has something to offer to some young person in America. So I would suggest to my fellow Americans that they can volunteer, whether it is reading to someone, whether it is going to a Boys Club or Girls Club, whether it is going to a juvenile detention facility. There are many ways that the people can help, and I would urge them to do that.

I congratulate my colleague for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I prepare to close.

Listening to the discussion reminds me of the fact that I spent some time as a big brother, and I think I may have gotten more out of the relationship than the young fellow who was my little brother. I remember a few years ago I got a call from a fellow who said to me that Vice President Al Gore was coming to town and did I want to meet with him. I said, well, I would not mind. He says, do you know who this is? I said, well, no, I really do not. He said, this is Courtney Miller, your lit-

tle brother, and of course, Courtney had grown up and at that particular time was working for the Vice President of the United States.

I also served for about 12 years as the commissioner of Boy Scouts in my community, and just day before yesterday I was at a Martin Luther King celebration, and there was a young fellow there who had become a minister, Jonathan Carter. As Jonathan participated in the services, he says, well, you know, I used to be a Boy Scout when you were the scouting commissioner and I have now become what I am. He said, I remember you coming to our Eagle Scout celebration and talking about how great it was.

So my point is that oftentimes those who serve as mentors will get as much from the relationship as the young people that they associate themselves with.

I listened to the chairman talking about the fact that everybody can be a part of this. One does not really need to have a degree. One does not need to have a title. One does not need to be an elected official. One does not have to be anything special other than themselves.

We have just finished celebrating the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, and one of the things that Dr. King often would say is that everybody can be great because everybody can serve. When it comes to mentoring young people, no matter who we are and where we are, we can serve. We can be a part of helping to grow and develop the life of someone else.

So, again, I commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for this resolution and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for his comments and his commitment to mentoring. Ofttimes we hear the complaint "too busy," and yet I have found the time over the last 4 years, sometimes it is Saturday, sometimes it is a Monday, sometimes it is Friday, to meet regularly with a mentoree. I mentor a young person and also several members from my office have been mentoring here on Capitol Hill.

So, again, I would urge my colleagues to encourage their office staff to do the same.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the National Mentoring Month Resolution introduced by Congressman TOM OSBORNE. This resolution recognizes and supports the efforts of mentoring programs across our Nation. It embraces the notion that volunteer mentors can change the life of a troubled teen. This resolution celebrates the month of January as a month-long campaign focused on raising awareness of mentoring programs, their impact on our youth, and information on how to volunteer to become a mentor.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor to Congressman OSBORNE's resolution. Both Coach OSBORNE and I worked as mentors before coming to Congress and both felt a need

to raise awareness of the cause once we were elected. Last Congress, we successfully passed the Mentoring for Success program, which provided money to start up new mentoring programs across the country. We also fought for increased Federal funding for local mentoring programs bringing that total to \$100 million this year. In addition, we founded the Congressional Mentoring Caucus, a bipartisan organization designed to disseminate information about the positive impact mentoring programs have on our Nation's children.

Mentoring programs offer many benefits to children, particularly as it relates to educating our children. These programs are proven to help prevent children from dropping out of high school. In the state of Florida, we had a big problem. Only 53 percent of our children were graduating from high school. So, in Central Florida, we decided to do something about it by creating the Orlando/Orange County Compact Program. The Compact Program is a mentoring program that matches up students at risk of dropping out of high school with mentors from the business community. The mentors meet with the students 1 hour a week to work on homework and projects.

The results from this mentoring program have been dramatic. Over a period of 10 years, 98 percent of the children in the Compact Program have graduated from high school—the No. 1 graduation rate in the United States.

I would also like to discuss the crime prevention benefits of mentoring programs. In Florida, 70 percent of the inmates in our jails and prisons are high school dropouts. It costs taxpayers \$25,000 a year for each Federal prisoner, compared with only \$5,000 a year to educate a student in our public schools. Clearly, making the investment in mentoring programs now will save us literally hundreds of millions of dollars down the road in terms of reduced jail costs and reduced welfare costs.

In summary, mentoring programs make a meaningful difference in the lives of our young people; they improve education, prevent crimes, and will save us money. I urge all of my colleagues to support National Mentoring Month by participating in local programs in their home districts—together we can make a difference in the lives of our children.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleague from Nebraska, TOM OSBORNE, in support of House Resolution 491, which recognizes the critical role of mentors in our children's lives.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, "It is one of the most beautiful compensations of this life that no man can sincerely try to help another without helping himself."

I can think of no better way to summarize the true reward of mentoring than by recognizing the inherent truth in this statement.

The mentoring partnership is unique, because it is one of the few relationships where both sides stand to benefit immensely.

Both individuals bring their own—and oftentimes, very different—set of life experiences to the table, and this has the pleasantly surprising effect of forcing us outside of our own comfort zones.

It is easy for us to relate to those with whom we share obvious similarities, but venturing outside of that comfort zone gives us the opportunity to view the world from an entirely different perspective.

While it may seem too difficult, or uncomfortable at first, you will find that you are a richer person for it in the end.

My experiences as the executive director of the Aaron Price Fellows Program have also taught me a great deal about the rewards of mentoring.

Being a mentor is not about rescuing someone—but it is about helping young people to discover their own hidden strengths and talents.

In today's world, children need more than a sense of right and wrong. They need knowledge, and they need someone they can trust to provide it to them. The risk factors that face teenagers today are not only dangerous—they are prevalent.

If we fail our responsibility to educate young people on the choices they face, then we fail to prepare them to make the right decisions. And the decisions they make will impact them for the rest of their lives—for better or for worse.

In these situations, the most important information they can receive will come not from a textbook, but from the wisdom and experience of someone who cares; someone who has taken the time to invest in that young person's life and to share the lessons life has to offer. It is here that we have the greatest potential to make a difference.

Believe it or not, the relationship built on trust and mutual respect can be the one that finally opens the door to knowledge. It leads the way to a stronger sense of self and an ability to confront life's challenges wisely. To put it in the simplest of terms—mentoring matters.

No matter what side of the mentoring relationship you find yourself on, the rewards will last a lifetime.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the resolution, this Member wishes to add his strong support for H. Res. 491, which supports efforts to encourage more individuals to become mentors. In addition to raising awareness, a key provision is to commend those who give their time and talents to support mentoring initiatives.

This Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce for bringing this important resolution to the House Floor today; this issue is very timely as January 2004 is National Mentoring Month. This Member would also like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. OSBORNE] for sponsoring H. Res. 491 and for his personal interest in establishing mentoring opportunities nationwide.

Many children throughout the United States face difficult situations—and when matched with a caring and responsible adult, positive results ensue. Research has shown that mentoring benefits young people in a positive manner by increasing school attendance, improving rates of secondary school graduation and college attendance, decreasing involvement with drugs and alcohol, and reducing violent behavior.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support H. Res. 491.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 491, a bill that promotes mentoring as a very worthwhile and much needed cause.

This measure recognizes that mentors serve as a guiding light, a benchmark, and a valu-

able asset for the many young people in America who might not otherwise have access to such a role model.

For many young people, mentors set an example of civility and stability. Mentors promote education and community respect. Mentors teach young people that there are many benefits to contributing to selfless efforts such as charity drives, neighborhood cleanups, and serving in soup kitchens.

In my congressional district of northeast Florida, there are a great many volunteers that selflessly give guidance, time, and resources to young people.

This resolution thanks those people who currently serve as mentors, and places a special focus on tapping into the vast pool of potential mentors. My hope is that this resolution will motivate more adults to take action to help America's young people.

This House resolution recognizes numerous studies documenting that mentors help young people to augment social skills, enhance emotional well being, improve cognitive skills, and to plan for the future. It also recognizes that for some children, having a caring adult mentor to turn to for guidance and encouragement can make the crucial difference between success and failure in life.

As a mentor, I personally know the satisfaction it brings to offer advice and guidance to a young person. I have known my mentor, Derek Williams, for many years. Over that period we have become good friends. Today I am proud to say that he is in college, furthering his education, and building a strong foundation for his future.

This measure does more than encourage mentoring; it gives thanks to those who already participate in mentoring programs. We should shower these people with praise because their actions do a lot to benefit society. That is why during the 107th session of Congress, I introduced a bill establishing American Youth Day, a measure encouraging communities all across the Nation to set aside one day each year to honor organizations and individuals that take the time to help young people.

For all its wealth and prosperity, in recent years America has been suffering from what I call problems of the soul, where courts and Congress do not have any jurisdiction. So many of our neighbors have lost their moral compass and need help finding their way again when it comes to moral values. This is most true when it comes to our young people.

There no longer seems to be a period in young people's lives when kids can just be kids. Mr. Speaker, it makes no difference what their race, their gender, their ethnicity. These negative images and influences make no distinction and no prejudices; all young people are fair game.

So it is incumbent on each and every one of us to offer our time and energy and love to children to provide positive role models and influences to young people to give them guidance and hope.

Currently, 17.6 million young people, nearly half the youth population, want or need mentors to help them reach their full potential. Only 2½ million youth are in formal mentoring relationships, leaving 15 million young people still in need of mentors.

This resolution is a call to action, designating January 2004 as National Mentoring Month. It is my hope that this month-long cele-

bration of mentoring will encourage more adults to volunteer their time as mentors for young people and enlist the involvement of nonprofit organizations, schools, businesses, faith communities, and government agencies in the mentoring movement.

As President Bush noted last night in his state of the Union address, America's young people face dangers. Young people face negative cultural influences that glorify and glamorize those things that can hurt them most. Mentoring is focused on providing young people the best our society can offer—hope, stability, guidance, and understanding.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 491, legislation recognizing the importance of mentoring.

This resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), reminds us all of the important role that caring adults play in the lives of our Nation's youth, and I thank the gentleman for his work in Congress—as well as his work with his own mentoring organization, "TeamMates of Nebraska"—on this important issue.

Today's teens cope with major physical changes, emotional ups and downs, peer pressures and a changing identity, but they are also confronted by a more complex and impersonal society where drugs and alcohol are easily available and tragedies, such as AIDS and violence, strike too close to home. In this time of growth and uncertainty, our children need positive role models, or mentors, in their lives.

Simply, a mentor is an adult who, along with parents, provides young people with support, counsel, and friendship. Most important, mentors are people who care. And, for many children, that makes all the difference.

According to recent research, children with mentors are 46 percent less likely to begin using illegal drugs, 52 percent less likely to skip school, and 33 percent less likely to get into fights. In addition, children with mentors reported greater confidence in their performance at school and better relationships with their families.

Despite these positive outcomes, too many children who need a mentor do not have one. In my state of Delaware alone, an estimated 10,000 young people could benefit from a positive, supportive relationship with an adult, but approximately 7,000 are currently served.

It is therefore appropriate that January is National Mentoring Month, a time in which we encourage caring adults to reach out to the children and youth in their communities. As part of that effort, I want to recognize the many businesses, churches and community groups that partner with our schools to provide mentors to children in need as well as the informal mentoring relationships that exist between teachers, coaches and neighbors. I also want to recognize those who lend their expertise or contribute financially to mentoring organizations. Their support is as important as volunteering to become a mentor.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his resolution and I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 491.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING ACHIEVEMENTS OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, THE JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, AND CORNELL UNIVERSITY IN CONDUCTING THE MARS EXPLORATION ROVER MISSION

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 490) recognizing and commending the achievements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and Cornell University in conducting the Mars Exploration Rover mission, and recognizing the importance of space exploration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 490

Whereas since its inception in 1958 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has achieved extraordinary scientific and technological feats;

Whereas the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's exploration of space has taught us to view Earth, ourselves, and the universe in a new way, opening our eyes and minds to great and new possibilities;

Whereas for over 40 years the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Jet Propulsion Laboratory has led the world in the robotic exploration of the solar system, commanding the first United States unmanned missions to the Moon, Venus, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and most recently, the edge of our solar system;

Whereas the Jet Propulsion Laboratory began the space age for the United States in 1958 with the successful development and launch of the Explorer 1, the first United States satellite;

Whereas the Jet Propulsion Laboratory conducted the first interplanetary mission, in which the Mariner 2 spacecraft arrived at Venus in December 1962;

Whereas over 100 years ago Russian astrophysicist Konstantin Tsiolkovsky asked, "to observe Mars from a distance of several tens of kilometers, to land on its satellite or even on its surface, what could be more fantastic?";

Whereas the Jet Propulsion Laboratory fulfilled Konstantin Tsiolkovsky's vision when it navigated the Viking mission, developed the Viking Orbiter, and in 1976 successfully operated the Viking 1 and 2 robot landers on Mars, the first missions to land a spacecraft safely on the surface of another planet;

Whereas more than 26 years after its launch in 1977, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's Voyager 1, which unlocked the mysteries of the outer planets of our solar system, continues to expand our understanding of the farthest reaches of our solar system;

Whereas the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's Mars Pathfinder successfully landed on the

Martian surface on July 4, 1997, launching the first United States free-roving exploration of another planet and inspiring a new generation of children to dream of the heavens;

Whereas after a journey of nearly seven years the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's Cassini-Huygens spacecraft will enter Saturn's orbit and begin to explore the solar system's second largest planet on July 1, 2004, and subsequently dispatch Huygens, a European-built probe, to the surface of Titan, Saturn's largest moon;

Whereas the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's Stardust spacecraft, having traveled more than 3,000,000,000 miles, will return to Earth on January 15, 2006, with the first extraterrestrial materials from beyond the orbit of the Moon;

Whereas the Mars Exploration Rovers Spirit and Opportunity were launched on June 10, 2003, and July 7, 2003, respectively, on missions to search for evidence indicating that Mars once held conditions hospitable to life;

Whereas Cornell University has led the development of the five science instruments carried by the two Rovers, is leading a science team consisting of 150 preeminent astronomers and engineers in the science investigation for the Mars mission, and is playing a leading role in both the operation of the two Rovers and the processing and analysis of the images and other data sent back to Earth;

Whereas the Rovers' landing sites were selected on the basis of intensive study of orbital data collected by the Mars Global Surveyor and Mars Pathfinder missions;

Whereas Spirit's landing site, formerly known as Gusev Crater and renamed Columbia Memorial Station, is thought to have once contained a large lake and may hold water-laid sediments that preserve important records of the lake environment, the sediments' highlands origins, and the sediments' river trip;

Whereas Opportunity's landing site, the Meridiani Planum, contains exposed deposits of a mineral that usually forms under watery conditions;

Whereas each Rover will conduct a three-month scientific study of the geologic records at the sites and evaluate whether those conditions would have been suitable for life;

Whereas each 384-pound Rover, roughly the size of a golf cart, traveled approximately 300,000,000 miles to reach Mars;

Whereas the craft carrying each Rover reaches speeds nearing 12,000 miles per hour when entering the Mars atmosphere before decelerating to a vertical stop in just over six minutes;

Whereas, during the period between entry into the Mars atmosphere and the Rovers' landing, over one dozen intricate operations need to be performed perfectly at just the right point for the Rovers to survive;

Whereas Spirit successfully completed entry, descent, and landing on January 3, 2004, at 11:35 p.m. eastern standard time, and within hours was beaming photographs of the Martian surface back to Earth;

Whereas Spirit is to be joined on the surface of Mars by its twin, Opportunity, on January 24, 2004; and

Whereas the engineers, scientists, and technicians of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory have played a vital role in the Nation's space program and set an example for the rest of us to follow: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(I) commends the engineers, scientists, and technicians of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and Cornell University for their years of effort leading up to the successful entry, descent, landing, and operation of the Mars Ex-

ploration Rover Spirit on the Martian surface on January 3, 2004;

(2) recognizes the importance to the Nation and to humanity of the exploration of space; and

(3) honors the achievements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and Cornell University in expanding our comprehension of the universe and fulfilling the human need to explore and understand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 490, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I would consume.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, President Bush unveiled our administration's vision for space exploration, including humans returning to the moon and eventually traveling on to Mars. The President's plan envisions a working relationship between both man and machine in charting new pathways for exploring the solar system.

On January 3, we all witnessed a new chapter in America's continuing space experience with the success and the landing of the Spirit on the martian surface. The creative and hardworking professionals at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California, and at Cornell University at Ithaca, New York, have once again hit the bull's eye after a 300-million-mile trip.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I rise in support of the gentleman from California's (Mr. DREIER) resolution, H. Res. 490, to honor NASA and those working on this exciting mission. Over the course of my tenure as chairman, I am particularly pleased that our Members have fought hard on a bipartisan basis to ensure the exploration of neighboring planets and to make the investment in basic research that is so necessary for human progress in the area of technology.

In the past, JPL has managed such spectacular missions as the Ulysses Solar Polar mission and the Cassini-Huygens mission to Saturn and the Viking Landers on Mars, and like so many other missions before them, Spirit, and soon its partner Opportunity, will also dramatically increase the scientific knowledge available to those of us on earth, scientific knowledge that will be put to good use for the benefit of all people.

The collaboration between the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and Cornell University, in enabling Spirit to deliver spectacular images of the martian

landscape, is exemplary of the teamwork among public and private sectors and academia. I consider the engineers, technicians and scientists at JPL and Cornell to be space pioneers of the finest tradition and heroes of technology.

Indeed, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) also is to be commended for his leadership in spearheading this resolution before us today. We all share the gentleman from California's (Mr. DREIER) desire to recognize the contributions being made in furthering our knowledge of the heavens. This is a fine tribute to the extraordinary scientific and technological accomplishments of the Nation's scientific community.

In closing, I applaud our administration's decision in taking bold steps in renewing our commitment to space exploration. I am confident that the dedicated men and women of our space program will be in the forefront of this Nation's efforts in taming new frontiers and expanding human knowledge and in leading human progress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The House today has the pleasant task of congratulating the Mars Exploration Rover team for their success in landing the Spirit Rover on Mars on January 3. The pictures being returned from the surface of Mars reminds us of the excitement that comes from seeing new places for the first time and wondering what we will learn from being there.

NASA, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and Cornell University can be proud of what has been accomplished, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution offered here by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, my friend, who demonstrated today the power of the Committee on Rules chairman by expediting this motion. I compliment him for that, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) who represents several of the employees there at JPL.

The premier position of the United States in planetary exploration owes much to NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Astronomy textbooks after 1980 had to be rewritten in the aftermath of the epic Voyager mission, and spacecraft developed by JPL have taken us to all of the planets except for Pluto.

□ 1100

But Mars has been a prime target for robotic exploration since the 1960s. There have been both triumphs and setbacks in that exploration as NASA has attempted ever more ambitious missions. The images have been awe-inspiring. For example, Mariner 9 showed us mountains taller than Everest and the immense Valley of the Mariners, a canyon deeper and longer than our own Grand Canyon.

We have learned much from our spacecraft in orbit around Mars, but

there is no substitute for being on the surface. The Spirit rover builds on the experience gained from the Viking missions of the mid-1970s as well as from Sojourner, the rover that accompanied Mars Pathfinder to the Red Planet in 1997. This time, however, we are going to visit a lot more of the Martian neighborhood.

The Nation's future in space has been much on my mind since the terrible day almost a year ago when the Space Shuttle *Columbia* did not make it home. The critical issue we have to address is how best to use human skills and robotic capacities in NASA's future programs. It was robotic Ranger and Lunar Orbiter spacecraft that prepared the way to the Moon for Armstrong and Aldrin, and it will be Spirit and its successors that will draw the maps future Martian explorers will carry.

Mr. Speaker, JPL has provided NASA some of its proudest moments, and today we salute its latest accomplishment. I am pleased to join in the resolution proposed by the gentleman from California and recommend its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), chairman of the full Committee on Science.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of the resolution offered by my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER); and I thank him for working with me to ensure that the resolution recognizes the contributions of Cornell University in upstate New York. One of the outstanding attributes of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory is the way it works with academic and private-sector scientists at universities throughout the United States, and indeed the entire world. Efforts like the current mission to Mars are truly team efforts in which our entire planet reaches out to other worlds.

We are already seeing the results of that teamwork with the stunning images of the Martian surface that the aptly named Recovery Spirit is beaming back to Earth. Now Spirit is beginning to examine a rock called Adirondack, named after a well-known feature of the upstate New York landscape. We look forward to the other rover, Opportunity, touching down successfully next week and beginning to explore another side of Mars.

The details of the Mars mission are at once mundane and other-worldly, simple to recite, yet mind-boggling to contemplate. Each of these Rovers weighs about 400 pounds and is about the size of a golf cart. Each is fitted with sensitive scientific equipment designed to survey the geology of Mars

and help an international team of 150 scientists back here on Earth determine whether water was ever a part of the Martian landscape and whether the planet could once have supported life.

This team of extraordinarily dedicated scientists is led by Dr. Steven Squyers of Cornell University. Dr. Squyers and his team developed the scientific instruments the rover missions carried. They operate them by remote control from over 15 million miles away here on Earth, and they are the chief investigators who will sift through the voluminous streams of data that the Rovers beam back to us daily.

The faculty and students at Cornell who are participating in this wondrous mission of discovery are clearly taking delight in their historic opportunity, and we are blessed to have the benefit of their years of hard work and dedication. I congratulate them and the scientists and engineers at NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory for their stunning success in the rover missions.

Even though the work on the Martian surface has just begun, the team at JPL and Cornell University have already provided us with priceless inspiration and new ways to see our universe. We look forward with great anticipation to sharing their achievements in the coming days and years.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for thousands of years people have looked to the heavens and wondered what was up there, what were the dots of light scattered on the hemisphere of the night sky, what is our place in all of this.

The Moon, the planets, and the stars became part of ancient religions. Heroes were immortalized as constellations. Planets, whose irregular movements and brightness set them apart from the stars, were named after gods. Celestial events foretold the death of kings; they augured victory in war.

But for our ancestors, the changing sky also had a practical effect. For millennia, the movements of the Moon and stars guided the rhythms of human life; they told people when to plant and when to harvest. Wars were planned based on the phases of the Moon.

Even as they wondered, planted, harvested, and fought in keeping with the seasons, people dreamed of visiting these other worlds, of expanding humanity's realm, of satisfying the human yearning to explore. The telescope, which Galileo first turned to the heavens in 1609, changed our view of the cosmos. The myriad points of light began to resolve themselves into planets with moons, galaxies, nebulae, and clusters of stars. The universe, which had seemed static, was revealed as a

place of infinite distance and incredible dynamism. Our view of space and of ourselves was changed forever.

It would be another 450 years before human beings could begin to take our first forays from the protective cocoon of the Earth. Throughout that time, telescopes grew larger and more powerful; astronomers learned more about our solar system, our galaxy, and the tens of millions of other galaxies throughout the universe. Still, even as the Moon and our nearby planetary neighbors tantalized us, they seemed hopelessly out of reach.

With the development of large rockets after World War II, humans were finally able to escape the Earth's gravity and venture into space. During the past half century, from the grapefruit-sized Explorer I, which was America's first satellite, to the International Space Station now being built 200 miles above us, we have begun to learn to operate in the harsh environs of space.

Throughout its existence, America's space program has operated on dual tracks. On the one hand, we have stressed human space flight, which is costly, often dangerous. With the exception of Apollo lunar landing missions, humans have not ventured beyond the relative safety of low-Earth orbit. The other track we have followed is the robotic exploration of our solar system, using spacecraft that are impervious to the harsh conditions of space and unaffected by the enormous distances necessary to explore our planetary neighbors.

Our unmanned space probes, from the Ranger and Surveyor craft that paved the way for Apollo, to the Voyager spacecraft that explored the outer planets and are still continuing to send back data even as they leave the solar system, have increased our comprehension beyond anything even contemplated half a century ago.

On Mars, we have witnessed dust storms on Olympus Mons, the largest mountain in our solar system. We have peered through Venus' clouds at its broiling surface. We have discovered new moons and ring systems around the outer planets. And as we speak, a small spacecraft bearing dust from a comet is zooming back towards the Earth and will parachute into Utah on January 15, 2006.

This summer, the Cassini spacecraft will enter the orbit of Saturn and will dispatch a small probe called Huygens to explore the atmosphere of Saturn's largest moon, Titan.

NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, managed by the California Institute of Technology, has designed, built, and controlled all of these programs. JPL has been the pioneer of our exploration of the solar system from the beginning of our space program. Earlier I mentioned JPL's Explorer I, America's first satellite. At the time it was launched, the United States has fallen behind the Soviet Union in the space race, and several other attempts at getting an American Sputnik into

orbit had ended in fiery explosions on the launch pad. Not only did Explorer I salvage our pride, but the tiny satellite discovered the Van Allen radiation belts that circle the Earth.

Every American space probe that has visited another planet was managed by JPL. Through the wonders of technology, we have zoomed by Jupiter with Voyager, witnessed a Martian sunset with Viking, and rolled across the surface of Mars with Sojourner.

Whom do we have to thank for unlocking the wonders of our solar system, for providing brilliant three-dimensional images of the Martian surface, and for making us desire even great discoveries? For this, we must thank the women and men of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California. Each day, under the leadership of Dr. Charles Elachi, the employees of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory work tirelessly to develop and manage America's robotic exploration of space.

Mr. Speaker, they have done it again. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory has brought America back to Mars. I am proud to join with my distinguished colleague and neighbor, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), in introducing this resolution honoring the men and women of NASA, and especially the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, whose years of effort paid off so spectacularly when the Mars exploration rover Spirit landed on January 3.

Mr. Speaker, led by principal investigator, Steve Squyres, Jet Propulsion Laboratory employees like Peter Theisinger, Richard Cook, Rob Manning, Jennifer Trosper, Mark Adler, Jim Erickson, Matt Wallace, Joy Crisp, Joel Krajewski, Jason Willis, Jim Donaldson, and Jan Chodas have worked around the clock since Spirit's arrival on Mars.

Spirit, the first of JPL's rovers to land on Mars, and Spirit's twin, Opportunity, which is scheduled to touchdown on January 24, will conduct a 3-month scientific study to evaluate whether conditions at one time have been suitable for life on Mars. Equipped with cameras, spectrometers, and a grinder, these robotic explorers are poised to unlock the mysteries of Mars. The breadth of their discoveries is yet unknown, but our confidence in their abilities and the ability of the scientists at JPL, who now live not according to the cycles of their fellow Earthlings but in keeping with the Martian day, is sky high.

Mr. Speaker, Spirit's landing is another milestone in our exploration of the solar system. Let us take a moment to reflect on this occasion and honor those who made it possible. For tomorrow. Our thirst is renewed and our exploration continues.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), and I might add the Member in this body who represents JPL in California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I want to rise and join my colleagues, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), who very appropriately recognized the important contribution that Cornell University has made in this effort. And I should say that, even though I have been out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in La Canada/Flintridge, the people in that town like to say that, as well as Pasadena. Pasadena and La Canada/Flintridge both claim the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), used to represent La Canada/Flintridge. He represents the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, and I am privileged to actually represent the facility of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, which is in La Canada/Flintridge.

But as I am at JPL, I have to say to my friend from New York that I have regularly seen the pennants of Cornell University hanging in that facility. So Cornell has a very great presence; and as the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) said, Dr. Steven Squyres, who was the principal investigator, has in fact played a big role in recognizing the importance of Cornell to this project.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), my colleague, I am happy to say was with us the night we were able to get images back, the night after the Mars exploratory rover Spirit landed, and has been a real visionary when it comes to the issue of space exploration. I also want to join in congratulating the former member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), who is now, I am happy to say, the ranking minority member of not only the subcommittee that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) chairs but of the full Committee on Science; and of course my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), who, as I said, did represent JPL and still continues with a very strong dedication to the science program and this great vision that is out there.

□ 1115

The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) gave a great outline of the history of the fascination that we as humans have had for outer space. I think that as we look at where we are going, it is amazing to see this debate which is raging on right now. I am somewhat saddened to hear some of my colleagues refer to the vision that the President set forth in his speech before the employees of NASA a week or so ago as being a joke. I know there are a lot of people who are very cynical about this whole notion of vigorously pursuing the goal of further pursuit of exploration in space, the Moon and Mars in particular.

The reason I am discouraged about it is that I regularly look now into the

eyes of young children who have this great fascination as they look towards the challenge of space exploration. One of the things that is particularly encouraging for me is that that same kind of fascination exists among many Members of Congress, not all but many Members of Congress, and it also exists today among every single one of those people who were named by the gentleman from California. Charles Elachi and the great team, Steve Squyres and Pete Theisinger and all those whom the gentleman from California mentioned continue to have that same fascination and they also have this amazing intellectual curiosity which has played such a big role in pursuing this.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for us to describe in words the kind of excitement that has gone into this. The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and I have ridden the roller coaster ride. Four years ago last month, we saw the failure of the Mars polar lander. I had the opportunity to wait night after night at JPL to try and get some kind of message of a word back. Unfortunately we failed. But I am so often reminded of the words of Dr. Ed Stone, who was the predecessor of Director Charles Elachi, who said to me 4 years ago, this past month, "David, if we don't take risks, we won't learn anything."

That is really what this is all about, taking risks. As we rapidly approach the first anniversary of the tragic loss of those lives in the space shuttle *Challenger*, we can think about those seven men and women who lost their lives a year ago as we look at the great success that we are now experiencing with the Mars exploratory rover program. We have seen the successful landing and messaging coming back from Spirit. This coming weekend, I know my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) will be in at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory as we see what I know we all hope and pray will be the same kind of success as we get messages back after seeing the successful landing on another part of the planet of the Mars exploratory rover named Opportunity. Spirit and Opportunity. The names of the two rovers in many ways is exactly what this is all about.

There is one name of someone who was not mentioned by my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), who I would like to point to as an individual who actually played a role in the first Viking program nearly 3 decades ago, in 1975 and 1976. He is an individual who was probably the youngest person who was involved in that program 30 years ago, and today he is probably, if not the oldest, one of the oldest involved in the Mars exploratory rover program. His name is Gentry Lee. He has a fascinating outline of what it has been like going from 1975 all the way up to today.

Mr. Speaker, it is so clear that we have limitless opportunities as we look at space exploration. The kinds of tangible evidence that we have seen im-

proving our quality of life continues to go on and on and we still do not know what kinds of opportunities we will find. One of the naysayers was on television the other day. He said in criticizing this program, if we had Mars covered with gold and we went to Mars to get this gold and bring it back, it would cost more to do that than the value of the gold itself. When we look at the imaging technology that has been created with MRIs, when we look at the cellular technology and the satellite telephones and the tremendous advances that have been made technologically not only in the health area but in the area of communications and security, we have transcended the cost of that gold, the value of that gold with what it is that we are doing here.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to congratulate all of my colleagues who have been involved in this effort and I want to thank all who have joined as cosponsors of this resolution. I also want to include the appropriations subcommittee members who have been so important in this effort too, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) who have been very helpful and have joined as cosponsors. I thank again my colleague from Huntington Beach for his leadership and his continued vision, and I hope very much that we are able to, in a bipartisan way, pursue the goals that have been set forth with President Bush's very dynamic plans for space exploration.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Research.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Chairman DREIER, certainly Chairman ROHRABACHER and the rest of the cosponsors of the bill. Let me also thank the scientists at JPL, at Cal Tech, at Cornell that not only have a tremendous amount of knowledge but a tremendous amount of dedication to move ahead on these ventures, often at the sacrifice of a lot of their personal time.

My family has been very involved in JPL. On the 4th, two of my daughters, Stacia Smith and Juliana Bellinger, were at JPL, I like to think, representing me on January 4 at the successful landing. My son did his engineering degree at Cornell and my daughter and her husband, Elizabeth and Fred Burnette, worked at JPL for 8 years. Elizabeth studied physics at Cornell. Just the accomplishments and the excitement that it has brought to this country over the years, somehow it would be nice to renew that kind of dedication and achievement. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, research is going to be the key to our future economy, so developing the kind of products that people around the world want to buy and developing the

ways to produce those products at a competitive cost is part of the key to our continued economic success.

In conclusion, my very great compliments to the scientists and the management at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and again my thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the new ranking member of the committee for his kindnesses and generosity. That bodes well for the future.

Science is fun. I can vouch for that as someone who has been a practicing scientist for over 2 decades. Science is also interesting. And science is rewarding. All of that is epitomized by the success of the rover that is currently on Mars transmitting pictures to us and also scientific data and information to us. I am very pleased to join in congratulating the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and their scientists for the successful landing and operation of the rover Spirit on Mars. For over 40 years, the dedicated scientists at JPL have built cutting-edge robotic explorers that have investigated other planets and the far reaches of our solar system and even beyond. These missions have opened windows to the universe, provided us with invaluable scientific information and inspired generations of scientists and engineers.

Just 2 months ago, I was privileged to lead a group of science committee members on a tour of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. That tour included an exciting meeting with Dr. Daniel McCleese, who is the chief scientist and Dr. Peter Theisinger, the project manager for the Mars exploration project. Their enthusiasm and devotion to this work was clearly evident during our discussion, and it epitomizes the excitement that the scientists at JPL have. They worked endless hours and I am sure they are so interested and excited in their work that they would be willing to do that work without pay if they had some other means of putting food on the table.

Science is fun, as I said, and it is very clear that this grand experiment on Mars is exciting and interesting to our students, our children at our elementary and secondary schools. That is extremely important, because we do not have enough Americans studying science and engineering. Our engineering enrollments in American universities have steadily declined in the last 20 years. One of the reasons is that children in our schools are not excited enough about science. I want to thank JPL and NASA for their efforts to stimulate the excitement of the students in the schools and help generate a new generation of scientists and engineers.

I certainly want to congratulate JPL and all its partners on this latest success in landing the rover Spirit on

Mars. It is truly moving to see the years of devoted scientific work succeed in this effort.

As I saw the first pictures coming back, tears welled in my eyes at the tremendous advancements in science that we are seeing. This experiment also epitomizes what we must do if we are to meet the President's vision. We cannot just pop humans in a space capsule and send them off to Mars. There is an incredible amount of groundwork to be done and the Spirit is one example of the type of work that we have to do if we are going to explore our planetary systems. These experiments are far, far less expensive than sending a human being to Mars and we will have, I would estimate, at least 20 and perhaps even 40 years of such experiments before we are ready to tackle the very difficult and expensive task of sending a human to another planet.

I congratulate once again the JPL crew for their work, and not only JPL, but all of NASA and all the scientific community in the United States. The scientists and engineers continue doing this work in generally anonymity. The great excitement we see them exhibiting as they succeed in their experiments is typical of what goes on in laboratories across the United States, and in fact, across the world, but which we, as laymen, never tend to see. Science is a great profession. It is fun, it is interesting, but especially it is important to the human spirit and important to the success of our Nation and the improvement of the prosperity and the general knowledge of this country. Thank you, JPL.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON). He has been a terrific partner in these efforts that we have gone through in these last 5 years. To the degree that our country has had successful space missions and is developing technologies that will help us on Earth, it has a lot to do with the bipartisan spirit that we have had in our subcommittee and the great and hard work and responsible leadership that the gentleman from Tennessee has provided. He is moving up now. He will be missed.

The bipartisan spirit I talk about is so evident in everything that we do in this subcommittee. Let me note that there are no Democrats and Republicans, there are Americans in our subcommittee. We work together as such. We all believe that if America is to be a prosperous country, if our people are to live good lives and see our standard of living increase for average Americans, that we must remain a major power in space, we must develop the technologies and the science that is necessary to uplift humankind into the cosmos.

□ 1130

If America is to remain at peace, if we are to live in peace, we must be a

leading space power. When we meet the challenges of terrorism or the challenges of gangsters throughout the world, gangster regimes that would kill our people, that would harm us, that would threaten the stability and peace of the world, it is our technological edge that gives us the ability to thwart these threats. If we were not the number one power in space and instead that mantle would shift over to some despot or gangster regime or antidemocratic regime, for example, on the mainland of China where they still have the world's worst human rights abusers who are now making investments in space technology, we would not be safe and secure on this planet. The free people on this planet and the American people could not live in peace and security if despots held the high ground, which is space and space technology.

And, finally, if we are to remain a free people, if the United States and America is to remain free, which is our number one value, after all, that unites all Americans, we Americans of every race and every religion and every ethnic background are united by a concept of liberty and justice for all which we pledge to our Flag, but if we are to remain free and have liberty and justice for all, we must be the technological leaders in space because we must remain the society that leads humankind to conquer new frontiers. If we lose that part of the American character that pushes back the frontier and that chooses to lead mankind into places where it has not gone before and to explore that which has not been explored, if we lose that aspect of our character, we will not remain a free people for long.

So what we are doing when it comes to these great achievements like we are applauding today, we are fulfilling our mission that was set out over 200 years ago by our Founding Fathers to lead humankind into a better world and perhaps into the cosmos.

I thank my colleagues for the support they are giving to America's space program. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and my friends on the other side of the aisle for being bipartisan and cooperative and all of us for being the type of Americans necessary to maintain that struggle that started with our Founding Fathers over 200 years ago. God bless them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 490.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AGREEING WITH THE SENTIMENT OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE PAUL SIMON

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 489) stating the agreement of the House of Representatives with the sentiment expressed by the Senate in Senate Resolution 281.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 489

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon became, at the age of 19, the Nation's youngest editor-publisher when he accepted a Lion's Club challenge to save the Troy Tribune in Troy, Illinois, and subsequently built a chain of 13 newspapers in southern and central Illinois;

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon used the Troy Tribune to expose criminal activities and in 1951, at age 22, was called as a key witness to testify before the United States Senate's Crime Investigating Committee;

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon served in the Illinois legislature for 14 years, winning the Independent Voters of Illinois "Best Legislator Award" every session;

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon was elected Lieutenant Governor in 1968 and was the first in Illinois history to be elected to that post with a Governor of another party;

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon served Illinois in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate with devotion and distinction;

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon is the only individual to have served in the Illinois House of Representatives, the Illinois Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and the United States Senate.

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon was the founder and director of the Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, Illinois, and taught there for more than six years in the service of the youth of our Nation;

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon wrote over 20 books and held over 50 honorary degrees;

Whereas the Honorable Paul Simon was an unapologetic champion of the less fortunate and a constant example of caring and honesty in public service;

Whereas his efforts on behalf of Illinoisans and all Americans earned him the esteem and high regard of his colleagues; and

Whereas his tragic death has deprived his State and the Nation of an outstanding lawmaker and public servant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives agrees with the sentiment expressed by the Senate in Senate Resolution 281.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a resolution basically concurring with the sentiments expressed in Senate Resolution 281, a resolution regarding, really,

the life of Senator Simon, who unfortunately passed away this last December at the age of 75. The Senator had quite a distinguished life of many accomplishments, was during his lifetime both a journalist and an author as well as a public servant. He was prodigious in his work product, passionate in his concerns for his constituents, and cared a great deal.

I must say he and I would not have agreed on anything probably except perhaps the desire to do the best we could for our country. He was an honorable public servant and someone who is fitting should be commended.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to offer for this body's consideration House Resolution 489, a bill stating the agreement of the House of Representatives with the sentiment expressed by the Senate in Senate Resolution 281 regarding former Illinois Senator Paul Simon, who regrettably passed away on December 9, 2003, shortly after undergoing heart surgery.

The Honorable Paul Simon was born November 29, 1928, in Eugene, Oregon. At the age of 19, Simon became the Nation's youngest editor-publisher when he accepted a local Lion's Club challenge to save the Troy Tribune newspaper in Troy, Illinois. In little time, Paul created a chain of 13 newspapers in southern and central Illinois that were notable for their hard-hitting investigative journalism, as was demonstrated when one of his papers, the Tribune, exposed syndicate gambling connections in Madison County, Illinois.

Paul Simon served our Nation in the U.S. Army from 1951–1953. Following his military service, Paul ran for state office and was elected to the Illinois House in 1954. He then was elected into the Illinois Senate in 1962. During his 14 years in the state legislature, he won the Independent Voters of Illinois' "Best Legislator Award" every session.

Simon was elected lieutenant governor of Illinois in 1968, and in this capacity, he became the people's ombudsman. He is widely credited with turning what had been a ceremonial position into a position focused on improving Government's ability to better serve its citizens.

After narrowly losing the 1972 Democratic gubernatorial primary to Dan Walker, Simon started the public affairs reporting program at Sangamon State University in Springfield, Illinois (now the University of Illinois at Springfield), and lectured during the 1972–1973 school year at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Simon was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1974 and served Illinois' 22nd and 24th Congressional Districts for 10 years. During his service in the House, Simon played a leading role in drafting and enacting major legislation covering a wide range of issues, including education, disability policy, and foreign affairs. While in the House, he worked closely with former Speaker Newt Gingrich in establishing the Office of House Historian.

In 1984, Simon was elected to the U.S. Senate. During his years as a public official, Paul Simon was known for exceptional constituent service. He also was the Senate's pacesetter in convening town meetings. As a Senator, Simon held more than 600 town meetings throughout the state. He was also

known for sporting fashionable bow ties, which became his trademark.

Prior to leaving the U.S. Senate, Simon ranked as Illinois' senior Senator. In November 1994, Paul Simon announced that he would retire from the Senate when his term expired January 3, 1997, ending 12 years of exceptional service to the people of Illinois and to the people of the United States.

Simon holds over 55 honorary degrees and has written 22 books. Paul Simon married Jeanne Hurley of Wilmette, Illinois, in 1960, whom he met while both served in the Illinois House. They had two children, Sheila and Martin, three granddaughters and one grandson. After his first wife passed away, Senator Simon married Patricia Derge in May 2001.

Please join me in honoring the life and service of this fine man and dedicated public servant by supporting House Resolution 489.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we note today the passing of a distinguished former Member of this House, Paul Simon of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for offering this motion, and I also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) for introducing this resolution.

I regret that I did not have the privilege of serving with Paul Simon. He retired from the Senate 2 years before I came to the House. I may not have served with Paul Simon; but like millions of Americans, I certainly knew of him and admired him greatly.

Paul Simon's reputation extended far beyond the geographic borders of the Land of Lincoln. Through a distinguished career that began at age 19 as a newspaper editor and publisher and led him to seats in both houses of the Illinois general assembly, lieutenant governorship, and on to both Houses of the United States Congress, Paul Simon enjoyed a reputation of honesty, integrity, and diligence. Known for his trademark bowties, Simon championed reform and the cause of the less fortunate than himself.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Simon, the statesman, was a great American who made a difference during his long career in public life.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding me this time.

On December 9, 2003, the citizens of Illinois lost one of the true giants in the storied history of politics in our State. Paul Simon was a leader who

transcended political or ideological labels.

To be sure, he was a staunch liberal who fought for better housing, fair wages, a cleaner environment, and civil justice. At the same time, he also leaned conservative when it came to fiscal matters.

But it was the way he carried out the job that made Paul a revered figure in a State that is accustomed to larger-than-life figures. Paul Simon represented an approach to politics that is becoming more and more rare in today's world, an approach in which he not only respected the people he represented but he respected the people who were his peers and the institutions in which he served, including this House and the other body.

When I was first elected to the House in 1994, Paul was the senior Senator from Illinois, and he took time to reach out to me so we could become better acquainted and work on issues of mutual concern.

As a leading Member of the Senate, I am sure that he had many better things to do than getting to know a first-term Member of the House, but that was the way Paul did business. He knew that good relationships were important in politics and legislating, and I am a better Member of the House for Paul Simon's efforts to get to know me.

When Paul retired from the Senate following the 1996 election, he certainly could have landed some lucrative lobbying contracts, but he chose instead to continue influencing public policy through a different arena, one that could have a lasting impression on generations of future public servants, that is, teaching. From his perch as director of Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois University, he continued to stay in the public eye, and he was able to carry on his advocacy for many of the issues he held so dear. He wrote prolifically on many issues during his time at SIU. He continued to travel the world to talk about the issues in which he so passionately believed. I would imagine he was as busy in his role with the institute as he was during his time in the Senate.

And to this day I am sure Paul Simon's approval numbers in Illinois are higher than any politician in our State.

Paul is someone who should be used as a benchmark, not only for future generations of leaders but for today's politicians as well. Paul Simon taught us that one can really get ahead through civility, common courtesy, and a respect for those with opposing viewpoints. That is a far cry from what many of our citizens believe today about their elected representatives. All of us could do this job a little better if we follow in the footsteps and examples of Paul Simon.

I might say that when I first got to the House, Paul recommended that I get involved in a program called Everybody Wins, which is a reading program

where some of us branch out around the Capital and read as mentors to students; and if it were not for Paul's initiative for me to get involved in that program, which I have been involved with, and it is a great program here in Washington, D.C., I would not have been involved. But that is the way Paul Simon was. He was an example of not only a mentor for children but to all of us who have come to know and love him. And he will be missed in Illinois and certainly missed at Southern Illinois University. And I thank the committee for recognizing him and adopting the Senate resolution.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 489 to honor my good friend Senator Paul Simon, who sadly passed away on December 9, 2003.

Senator Simon was a good friend and a dedicated public servant. Paul worked as a newspaper publisher, public servant, author, and teacher. He was elected to the Illinois general assembly in 1954 and the Illinois senate in 1962 and was elected lieutenant governor of Illinois in 1968.

While a member of the Illinois legislature, Paul won the Independent Voters of Illinois' "Best Legislator Award" every session of the legislature.

Senator Simon served in this body for 10 years, beginning in 1974 when he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, then the United States Senate for 8 years and ran for President of the United States in 1988. Throughout his public service, Paul was known for his honesty and his integrity. That was his hallmark.

As a Member of the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate, he balanced fiscal conservatism with social liberalism. Paul was a champion of a balanced budget amendment and worked to overhaul the Federal student loan program so that students and their families could borrow money directly from the U.S. Government. Paul also led efforts to curb television violence, leading the industry to monitor the amount of violence on their TV screens. In addition, Paul was instrumental in the establishment of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Paul Simon was always concerned about the cultural isolation of U.S. college students and young Americans in general. One of his first books was "The Tongue-Tied American" on the need for American students to learn a second language. Paul sponsored several programs to increase international education and understanding in American schools, and he was working to create a foreign exchange program to allow more American students to study abroad.

As impressive as his legislative record was during his tenure in Congress, he never forgot his constituents and was known for exceptional constituent service. During his service in the U.S. Senate, Paul held over 600 town meetings throughout the State of Illinois to hear the issues that were important to the citizens of Illinois.

Paul's career began at age 19, when he became the youngest editor-publisher of the Troy Tribune in Troy, Illinois, in Madison County, Illinois. By 1966 he had built a chain of 13 newspapers in southern and central Illinois, which he sold in order to concentrate more time on public service and writing.

Upon his retirement from the U.S. Senate, Paul formed the Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale to share his wisdom and advocacy with the next generation of students. In addition to chairing the Public Policy Institute, he also taught classes in political science, history, and journalism at SIU.

□ 1145

Senator Simon is survived by his two children, and Martin, his four grandchildren, Reilly Marie, Corey Jeanne, Brennan and Nicholas, and his second wife, Patti and her two children, Jennie and Bill. Jennie currently works right here on the Hill for our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. Speaker, at Senator Simon's funeral, Senator TED KENNEDY said, "In another era, he would have been a founding father. He was that good. He will never be forgotten."

Senator Simon was a great man that served our country with honor and distinction. It is fitting that we honor him with this resolution today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, not very much will get me motivated enough to wear a bow tie in this world, but now I have done it two days in a row, and it is a Paul Simon tie. When he ran for President, at the funeral, at the wake, the lapel pins had the trademark bow tie. This is a Paul Simon bow tie that I have been allowed to use by the Tomasewski family of Washington County, and I thank them for that. It only took me about 4 hours to tie it, but, once I got it down, I kind of slept with it last night and did not change shirts.

Paul was a great man. A lot has been said and gone over with regard to his history, and I will highlight a few other points. But I am going to talk about the man of faith, the man of religion.

I am of the Lutheran faith. Paul comes from a strong family of Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod. His father was a missionary in China. That

moral background and upbringing I think helped serve him well in the crusades that he fought in the future.

A lot of the pillars of my congregation in Holy Cross Lutheran Church in Collinsville remember Senator Simon fondly as a member of what was then called the Walther League, which was the youth group. They would meet throughout parts of Southern Illinois. And that friendship transcended partisan ideology, as a lot of my colleagues have said today, because when Senator Simon walked into any room, whether you agreed or disagreed, you never questioned the integrity, the thought, the desire, the real passion that he brought to any issue. I think we would do well in memory of him to emulate that, to remember that, and to bring that back into the civil discourse that sometimes we do not have here on the floor of the House.

He was also a great crusader. Again, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) mentioned at 19 his getting a newspaper in Troy, Illinois, just down the road from both of us, and using that paper to reform government, to fight corruption. Madison County and St. Claire County was a bastion of illegal activities, of crime and gambling, and at a very young age he really put his life at risk by writing and exposing those that would break the law. That courage, developed at a young age, just led on to a very, very successful career.

When he went to into the legislature, he pushed for and his best known legislation was the State's first act to require open meetings by local governments under most circumstances, the Open Meetings Act, Paul Simon's signature issue, which helped bring the public closer to the real discussions of what elected officials are doing. Now, sometimes we may not like that, but for the discourse and knowing what is really going on, requiring notification, requiring people to have access to these meetings, it is real reform.

Upon his retirement, everyone knows he is a noted author, has written tremendously various issues, he did not retire. He went down to Southern Illinois University in Carbondale around his home in Makanda, and continued to work and in transforming the public policy debate around the world.

I was privileged to call him a fellow member of faith, a friend. I was able to travel with him on airplane rides. He remembered my mother when she had some health issues just around the time when he had health issues. They exchanged greetings and notes. He was just that type of guy that made us all proud.

We will miss Senator Simon, and hopefully the members of the Illinois delegation and the members of both Chambers of Congress will remember his years of service and really dedicate ourselves to some of the higher ideas that Senator Simon really called us all to be. I thank him for his service and I thank him for his friendship.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the most distinct voice in the House of Representatives and one of the most distinguished Members.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me time.

Paul Simon was absolutely the head of that part of the Democrats in Illinois that I have been associated with for so long. As a matter of fact, he was like the Seal of Good Housekeeping. That is, if you could get Paul Simon to say something good about you or endorse you, then it was the highest honor. You could not get any better than that.

I have always remembered when I ran for the House, Senator Simon said to me, "I don't endorse in primaries generally. This year I am going to make two exceptions. I am going to endorse DICK DURBIN for my seat, who has been my protegee and worked with me. I am going to endorse you for the seat that you are running for." I have always counted that as one of the high moments of my political career.

Someone mentioned all of the town hall meetings that Senator Simon would hold. I can remember attending many of those. In many instances, there might be only 15 or 20 people there, sometimes 10, and I would be amazed that this United States Senator would be at a small town hall meeting with 10 or 12 people, in an African American community, a little church, a library, and he would stay there two, sometimes three hours, just talking to the two or three people, trying to educate, trying to stimulate, trying to motivate.

I can remember all the small receptions that he and his wife Jennie and the rest of us used to attend, always sort of swimming upstream. The last communication that I had from Senator Simon was just before he died. I got a letter from him in the mail and an article from the Chicago Tribune saying congratulations, I commend you all for the work you are doing on behalf of ex-prisoners, people who are coming home from jail. That was Paul Simon, always seeking to assist the underdog, those that society would sometimes look at the other way at; Africa, food, nutrition, hunger.

At his funeral, as it was coming to a close, I remembered the words of a song that we sometimes sing when a person has done what they can do, that says, "If when you give the best of your service, telling the world that the Savior has come, be not dismayed when men don't believe you, he'll understand and say well done."

Senator Simon, well done.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to get up and speak in honor of Paul Simon.

I first knew his brother, Art, through Bread for the World. I had been active in world hunger activities and in fact was a coauthor of a book regarding world hunger. When I read Bread for the World at that time I was very impressed with it. I knew that Senator Simon was Art's brother, so I was very pleased when I first had the opportunity to meet Senator Simon and have a discussion with him.

He was an honorable person, and, even though I never had close contact with him on a continuing basis, I was very impressed with his forthrightness, his thoughtfulness, his ability and his honesty. He set a high standard for all of us to follow.

I also appreciated the help of his wife, who was very interested in the Library of Congress. I was on the Committee on House Administration and served on the Joint House-Senate Committee on the Library of Congress, and she was a great help to me at various times in trying to achieve my objectives. They were a wonderful couple.

My last contact with Senator Simon was just 2 months ago, when I received a very kind, handwritten note from him. He had heard one of my speeches on the floor and sent me a quick note saying, in effect, "That is the kind of voice we need to hear more in the Congress." I thought that was an overwhelming act of kindness on his part, to take time at this point in life, with the difficulties he faced, to write to a relatively unknown Congressman from a neighboring State and express his appreciation.

This indicated what a wonderful person he was, the kindness and the thoughtfulness he had. I am just delighted to join in this accolade for him. He was a great man. We could use many more like that in the Congress.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the "Show Me State" (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member from Connecticut for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution honoring the late Senator Paul Simon. It was my privilege to have known Senator Simon for most of my life. I have fond memories of watching Congressman Simon on the House floor many years ago when I was a student and a doorkeeper, and he has long been a source of personal inspiration.

When I first came to know Congressman Simon, he represented Southern Illinois and served with my father on the House Committee on Education and Labor. He was among the most active and effective Members in the history of this institution, and I was not surprised when I recently learned that in 1983, Time Magazine cited Congressman Simon for passing more amendments than any other Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Paul Simon served in the Illinois House of Representatives, the Illinois

Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. Throughout his career, Paul Simon was famous for championing the causes of working people, children, the disabled and veterans. When he served in the Illinois legislature, he helped to create the State's community college system and the Illinois Arts Council. He also won the Independent Voters of Illinois Best Legislator Award every session in which he served.

While serving in the U.S. Congress, Paul Simon sponsored the Missing Children Act and the legislation establishing the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. He also wrote the National Literacy Act, the School to Work Opportunities Act and the Job Training Partnership Act amendments. He was a leader in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the establishment of the direct college loan program.

Deeply dedicated to the community that sent him to represent their interests in Washington, Senator Simon held more town hall meetings than any other Illinois senator and his office was legendary for its constituent services.

While in Congress, Paul Simon worked to enact legislation designating the first five federally chartered future high-speed rail corridors, which included the St. Louis-Chicago-Detroit/Milwaukee corridor, and to designate the Illinois-Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor. He was also instrumental in expanding the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, which is St. Louis's Gateway Arch National Park, to the State of Illinois.

□ 1200

He possessed a rare knowledge and understanding of the legislative process and manifested an extraordinary energy for public policy-making.

Senator Simon left us all way too soon. He lived a life dedicated to serving others, and he certainly left this world a better place for his time on Earth.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), former advisor to President Clinton.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution honoring the memory and lasting contributions of Paul Simon.

I was honored to work on his election to the Senate, where he made all of the people of Illinois and America proud. When we look across Illinois today, we see that we have an Attorney General who worked for Paul Simon and started a career in politics working for Paul Simon, a Member of Congress, a State Senator, a county commissioner. Although he is very famous for those who say that John Kennedy touched a set of idealisms for people to go into public service, for a number of us in Illinois, regardless of our party, Paul Simon

touched that chord of idealism; and we knew then that reaching for our ideals was possible by seeking a life in public service.

Despite winning five elections and winning elections in five different decades serving his State, his area, and his country in many different capacities, his character, integrity, and intelligence are what endure; and it is why Paul Simon today remains one of the most popular figures in the State of Illinois.

Long before they were fashionable, Paul Simon championed civil rights, education, and campaign finance reform. He saw in those areas his ideals being realized. In everything he did, he was guided by a deep, deep desire to help those who needed a voice. And for a number of us in Illinois, we can still hear his voice with "how are you today" and that deep sense that you were Paul Simon's person that he was talking to. And he always had a sense that he was not up here to be a vote, but to be a voice for our values, regardless of what party we came from. He taught many of us, and some of us, in fact, have come to this lesson hard in life, that you can disagree without being disagreeable.

After his retirement from Congress, he did not leave public service. He spent the remaining days of his life pursuing what he cared most about, which was education. As this resolution states, he remained an unapologetic champion of the less fortunate and a constant example of caring and honesty in public service.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to recognize a true hero for many of us in Illinois. We will always remember Paul Simon and honor his enduring contributions to the State of Illinois and to this country. His memory will be a blessing to those who follow in his path.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), my neighbor and good friend.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me such great honor and pleasure to join in support of this resolution in memory and to celebrate the life of former Senator Paul Simon who was my friend and my mentor and my Senator and my role model.

Paul Simon was unique. He was the real thing, though. When we look at him with his bow tie and his suit, he was an authentic person. And those who might make the mistake of kind of relegating Paul Simon to the kind of politician of the past, that would be wrong. Paul Simon, although he had that kind of almost old-fashioned gentlemanly way about him, was someone who we can learn a lot from today. He had incredible courage. The thing that Paul Simon really understood was that it is not only important for your own personal integrity to stand up for your beliefs, but that it was also really good politics.

Paul Simon his whole life was an opponent of the death penalty, not always a popular issue in the State of Illinois; and it is an issue that inspired a lot of hot feelings about that. And yet people who would disagree with him on that or, like me, who disagreed with him on the Balanced Budget Amendment pretty strongly, nonetheless often would come up to Senator Paul Simon and say, you know, Senator, I do not agree with you on this or that, or even, I do not agree with you on most things, but I trust you. I am going to vote for you. I admire the way that you stand up for the State of Illinois and for the things that you believe in. It would be wonderful if more of us would do that.

I went to Iowa. We just finished the Iowa primaries. I went to Iowa for a month for Paul Simon in 1988 and, by the end, of course, everybody could say the speech with him. I could just hear that voice saying, the United States is a great country, but we can be an even better country. And he believed that so much. His desire, as he stated it: I wanted to do something where I could continue to contribute. I did not get into office just because I wanted a title; I wanted to get something meaningful done, and he did. He continued to do that. That is so true. He did not just want to be something; he wanted to do something.

So when he retired from being in the Senate, he continued in his role at Southern Illinois University and all the while prodding all of us. We heard mention of those personal notes. He wrote a book called "Tapped Out," dealing with the water crisis around the world; and he really wanted me to get involved in that. He would write me letters. Then he sent me the book. He said, now look, your name is in the forward of the book. It said, to someone who is going to be working on this issue. I knew what he was saying to me: you better work on this issue; you are in my book.

Paul, I am going to be working on that issue and so many more where you forged the path.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this resolution and thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for introducing it.

My friend Senator Paul Simon was a statesman, a respected leader, and an unwavering champion of the little guy; and he possessed a heart, a smile, and a baritone voice that could fill a room. He was truly one of a kind, a principled human being, a principled politician, a real reformer, and an unapologetic idealist whose words were followed by genuine and unrelenting action.

From his time as a young journalist rooting out corruption in Illinois, to the 14 years he served in the general assembly in Springfield, to his distin-

guished tenure in Congress, Paul never wavered in his fight for fairness and justice. He never backed down. No matter the odds, no matter the political ramifications, no matter how unpopular or lonely his positions, he remained fervent and passionate.

Paul was a role model for many of us in the Illinois delegation today and for many who continue to seek public office. I know he is a role model for me.

During his tenure in the Senate, Paul fought ardently and selflessly on the issues that made a real difference in ordinary people's lives. He always saw the good in people and used that good for the benefit and the betterment of our country. He stood up with us in the fight for immigration reform and on so many other issues important to my constituents and to this country.

But my friend's legacy transcends politics. Paul was a beacon of hope for anyone who wished to dream the American Dream. He embodied the type of heart needed to sustain the uphill battles required to make real change, and he was the consummate underdog and dedicated his life to public service. He was always for the underdog and giving a voice to the concerns of the voiceless. Paul simply would have no part in pandering to the special interests. To him, public service was about one thing, people, and he maintained that steadfast commitment to them.

We lost an irreplaceable friend, a teacher, and a mentor. He touched countless lives in countless ways, and we will never forget him.

But just remembering Senator Simon is not enough; just honoring him is not enough. He would have wanted us to do more. He would have wanted us to stand together, to fight together; and I think that is what this resolution is really all about. It is about recognizing and building on Senator Simon's accomplishments, his ideas, his life and, indeed, his legacy. We should not let this enormous loss be the end of his work. We all have a responsibility now in this Chamber and across this country. We must embody Paul's heart and his spirit. We must embrace his honesty and his integrity.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress and this country face many challenges in the coming months and years. I think we would be well served to pause and ask, what would our friend, Senator Simon, do? I am confident that by asking that simple question, we will set ourselves on the right course.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am not from Illinois, but I have to tell my colleagues that Senator Simon was a man of all seasons, was a mentor and a teacher. And most importantly, when he talked, people listened. I remember when the Defense Language Institute, which is our premier language school in the world, and he was very dedicated to having Americans learn languages,

and it was threatened for closure, he called President Clinton and said, do not take that off the list. Clinton said, why are you interested in a base that is in California? And Senator Simon said, because it is an intellectual capital for languages and we need to keep it that way.

A very impressive man. The country will greatly miss him. He was the epitome of politics, the greatness of politics in America.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of the Committee on House Administration committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and myself, I would like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), and the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and the committee staff. Please join me in honoring the life and service of this fine man and dedicated public servant, Paul Simon, by supporting House Resolution 489.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution introduced today to honor the life and legacy of Paul Simon. I learned with great sadness of his death in December.

Senator Simon epitomized all that is best about Congress. He served in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and was a distinguished member in both chambers. His presence was a constant example of the importance of hard work, discipline, and compassion. Senator Simon believed that government could serve the people, and serve them in a positive way. He served his State and his Nation beginning in 1954, when he entered the Illinois State legislature. His service would continue until his death as a professor in Illinois, where he shared a lifetime of wisdom with the leaders of the future.

Senator Simon's season of service would take him to the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and the campaign trail as a candidate for the presidency. His work included fighting against television violence, working for those without jobs, and trying to balance the budget. I was pleased to join with him in raising the issue of gambling's ill effects on families, individuals, and communities. He was concerned about the welfare not only of Illinois, but of the entire Nation.

Senator Simon's talents were not limited to Congress. In his lifetime, he wrote over 20 books and was awarded over 50 honorary degrees. He was cerebral as well as practical. Senator Simon lived a life of the mind as well as a life dedicated to enlightening and lifting up his fellow citizens. After he left the Senate, Paul Simon returned home, and taught at Southern Illinois University, to impart his wisdom to the next generation, to enlighten young minds, and to continue serving his state.

His life was one of constant service in the public interest. Senator Simon lived many lives in one—editor-publisher, legislator, public crusader, professor. That he did so much is impressive. That he did it all so well and so selflessly is inspirational. Congress and the Nation is a lesser place for his passing, but both were greatly enriched by his life and his example. Senator Simon will be missed, but through

the lives he touched, the life he lived, and the lives he inspired, he will not be forgotten.

Our sympathies go to his family and our thanks to them as well for sharing this remarkable man with us.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the late Senator Paul Simon. Certainly, many of us recall his involvement, his active support for U.S. bilateral assistance to Africa and his work in the fight against apartheid in South Africa. Today, however, I want to pay special tribute to the Senator's long time advocacy for historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs. As the chair for the Postsecondary Education Subcommittees in both the House and the Senate, he lent his unwavering support for these institutions during reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as well as adding a pivotal endorsement of the creation of an endowment fund for HBCUs. While Paul Simon is a colleague who will always be remembered as a supporter of the disadvantaged, he will also be remembered for his belief that the disadvantaged could be successful with the right kind of assistance from government programs. Senator Simon will be sorely missed but we are all better from having known and worked with him.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution to commemorate my distinguished colleague, Senator Paul Simon. It is with great sentiment that I rise to honor Paul Simon for his life's accomplishments.

In the book of Isaiah, the prophet writes, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him who brings good news, who proclaims peace, who brings glad tidings of good things, who proclaims salvation, and who says to Zion, your God reigns." Through my personal experiences in working with Senator Simon, he was I believe, the epitome of those prophetic words from Isaiah. Paul, a son of a missionary, was a man who was known for his calm and comforting demeanor, a man that demonstrated a true testament of peace, and a man who believed in breaking barriers and shattering prejudices. I am not telling you what I think, but I am telling you what I know. I had the privilege to know him professionally and personally. Paul Simon was a Senator who earned the tremendous respect from all people who knew him. In my congressional district, he was revered by all. His calm temperament, his respect for mankind, and his unwavering commitment to fairness and equality was deeply admired in my community. He was vigilant in his fight for the struggle to protect and preserve civil liberties and human rights for all people.

Paul Simon was an icon for many political leaders such as myself and a "giant" in the history of the American democracy. During his tenure in Congress, Simon was a champion of education and a key advocate for literacy and lifelong learning. In the Senate, he was the author of the National Literacy Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, the Job Training Partnership Act amendments, the 1994 re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the direct student loan program. Senator Simon held numerous influential committee assignments, including serving as the Chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on Africa.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, Paul Simon was one of the most effective Senators to have served the citizens of Illinois, and the American people.

Although Senator Simon has been called to answer his new "heavenly" assignment, he leaves with us his legacy and principles of nobility that will never be forgotten.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 489.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(c) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that in light of the resignation of the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JANKLOW), the whole number of the House is adjusted to 433.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 20, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 20, 2004 at 5:55 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 349.

That the Senate passed S. Res. 284.

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy;

Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy;

Board of Visitors of the United States Air Force Academy;

United States-China Economic Security Review Commission.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH, *Clerk of the House.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H. Res. 492, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 491, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 490, by the yeas and nays, and
- H. Res. 489, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

□ 1215

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 492.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 492, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]
YEAS—398

Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Cunningham
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Davis (AL)
Akin	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Davis (IL)
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Davis (TN)
Andrews	Brown-Waite,	Davis, Jo Ann
Baca	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Bachus	Burgess	Deal (GA)
Baird	Burns	DeFazio
Baker	Buyer	DeLauro
Baldwin	Calvert	DeLay
Ballance	Camp	DeMint
Ballenger	Cannon	Deutsch
Barrett (SC)	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bartlett (MD)	Capito	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barton (TX)	Capps	Dicks
Bass	Capuano	Dingell
Beauprez	Cardin	Dooley (CA)
Becerra	Cardoza	Doolittle
Bell	Carson (OK)	Dreier
Bereuter	Carter	Duncan
Berkley	Case	Ehlers
Berry	Castle	Emanuel
Biggett	Chabot	Emerson
Bilirakis	Chocola	Engel
Bishop (GA)	Clay	English
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bishop (UT)	Coble	Etheridge
Blackburn	Cole	Evans
Blumenauer	Collins	Farr
Blunt	Conyers	Fattah
Boehlert	Cooper	Feeney
Boehner	Costello	Ferguson
Bonilla	Cox	Filner
Bonner	Cramer	Foley
Bono	Crane	Forbes
Boozman	Crenshaw	Ford
Boswell	Crowley	Fossella
Boucher	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Boyd	Culberson	Frost
Bradley (NH)	Cummings	Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Gerlach	Lucas (KY)	Ross
Gibbons	Lucas (OK)	Rothman
Gilchrest	Lynch	Roybal-Allard
Gingrey	Majette	Royce
Gonzalez	Maloney	Ruppersberger
Goode	Manzullo	Rush
Goodlatte	Markey	Ryan (OH)
Gordon	Matheson	Ryan (WI)
Goss	Matsui	Ryun (KS)
Granger	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Graves	McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Green (TX)	McCollum	T.
Green (WI)	McCotter	Sanchez, Loretta
Greenwood	McCrery	Sanders
Grijalva	McDermott	Sandlin
Gutierrez	McGovern	Saxton
Gutknecht	McHugh	Schakowsky
Hall	McInnis	Schiff
Harman	McIntyre	Schrock
Harris	McKeon	Scott (GA)
Hart	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)	Sessions
Hayes	Meeks (NY)	Shadegg
Hefley	Menendez	Shaw
Hensarling	Mica	Shays
Herger	Michaud	Sherwood
Hill	Millender-	Shimkus
Hinojosa	McDonald	Shuster
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Simmons
Hoeffel	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Hoekstra	Miller (NC)	Skelton
Holden	Miller, Gary	Slaughter
Holt	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Honda	Moore	Smith (NJ)
Hooley (OR)	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)
Hostettler	Moran (VA)	Smith (WA)
Houghton	Murphy	Snyder
Hulshof	Murtha	Solis
Hunter	Musgrave	Souder
Hyde	Myrick	Spratt
Inslee	Napolitano	Stark
Isakson	Neal (MA)	Stearns
Israel	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Issa	Neugebauer	Strickland
Jackson (IL)	Ney	Stupak
Jackson-Lee	Northup	Sullivan
(TX)	Norwood	Sweeney
Jefferson	Nunes	Tancredo
Jenkins	Nussle	Tanner
John	Oberstar	Tauscher
Johnson (CT)	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Johnson (IL)	Olver	Taylor (NC)
Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Terry
Johnson, Sam	Osborne	Thomas
Jones (NC)	Ose	Thompson (CA)
Jones (OH)	Otter	Thompson (MS)
Kanjorski	Owens	Thornberry
Kaptur	Oxley	Tiahrt
Keller	Pallone	Tiberi
Kelly	Pascrell	Tierney
Kennedy (MN)	Pastor	Toomey
Kennedy (RI)	Paul	Towns
Kildee	Payne	Turner (OH)
Kilpatrick	Pearce	Turner (TX)
Kind	Pelosi	Udall (CO)
King (IA)	Pence	Udall (NM)
King (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Upton
Kingston	Peterson (PA)	Van Hollen
Kirk	Petri	Velázquez
Klecza	Pickering	Visclosky
Kline	Pitts	Vitter
Knollenberg	Pombo	Walden (OR)
Kolbe	Pomeroy	Walsh
LaHood	Porter	Wamp
Lampson	Portman	Waters
Langevin	Price (NC)	Watt
Lantos	Pryce (OH)	Weiner
Larsen (WA)	Putnam	Weldon (FL)
Larson (CT)	Quinn	Weldon (PA)
Latham	Radanovich	Weller
LaTourette	Ramstad	Wexler
Leach	Rangel	Whitfield
Lee	Regula	Wicker
Levin	Rehberg	Wilson (NM)
Lewis (CA)	Renzi	Wilson (SC)
Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Wolf
Lewis (KY)	Rodriguez	Woolsey
Linder	Rogers (AL)	Wu
Lipinski	Rogers (KY)	Wynn
LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Hinchey

NOT VOTING—33

Abercrombie	Edwards	Marshall
Burr	Everett	Miller, George
Burton (IN)	Flake	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Frank (MA)	Platts
Davis (CA)	Franks (AZ)	Rahall
DeGette	Gephardt	Reyes
Delahunt	Gillmor	Serrano
Doggett	Hayworth	Sherman
Doyle	Hoyer	Tauzin
Dunn	Istook	Watson
	Kucinich	Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1239

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record with regard to the first vote of the day, House Resolution 492, I noticed that I am recorded as having voted in the negative. That is in error. I am in favor of the resolution, and I wish the record to reflect that I intended to vote in the affirmative.

HONORING MENTORS AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO RECRUIT MENTORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 491.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 491, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]
YEAS—397

Ackerman	Berry	Brown (SC)
Aderholt	Biggett	Brown, Corrine
Akin	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Burns
Baca	Blackburn	Buyer
Bachus	Blumenauer	Camp
Baird	Blunt	Cannon
Baker	Boehlert	Cantor
Baldwin	Boehner	Capito
Ballance	Bonilla	Capps
Ballenger	Bonner	Capuano
Barrett (SC)	Bono	Cardin
Bartlett (MD)	Boozman	Cardoza
Barton (TX)	Boswell	Carson (OK)
Bass	Boucher	Carter
Beauprez	Boyd	Case
Becerra	Bradley (NH)	Castle
Bell	Brady (PA)	Chabot
Bereuter	Brady (TX)	Chocola
Berkley	Brown (OH)	Clay

Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee

Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Mushra
Mulligan
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood

Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pomboy
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryan (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry

Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Waldeen (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—35

Abercrombie
Berman
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delahunt
Doggett
Doyle

Dunn
Edwards
Everett
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gephardt
Gillmor
Hayworth
Hoyer
Istook
Kucinich

Marshall
Miller, George
Nadler
Platts
Rahall
Reyes
Serrano
Sherman
Tauzin
Watson
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1249

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING ACHIEVEMENTS OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, THE JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, AND CORNELL UNIVERSITY IN CONDUCTING THE MARS EXPLORATION ROVER MISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 490. The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 490, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—389

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger

Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bishop (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman

Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall

Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee

Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Mushra
Mulligan
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood

Burns
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall

Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee

Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Mushra
Mulligan
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood

Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter

Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)

McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon

Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Akin
Berman
Burr
Burton (IN)
Carson (IN)
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delahunt
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards

Eshoo
Everett
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gephardt
Gillmor
Goode
Graves
Gutierrez
Hayworth
Herger
Hoyer
Istook
Kucinich

Lucas (KY)
Marshall
Miller, George
Nadler
Platts
Rahall
Reyes
Reynolds
Serrano
Sherman
Tauzin
Watson
Waxman

Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon

Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon

NOT VOTING—39

Abercrombie
Berman
Burr
Burton (IN)
Carson (IN)
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delahunt
Doggett
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards

Eshoo
Everett
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gephardt
Gillmor
Harris
Hayworth
Houghton
Hoyer
Istook
Jefferson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1256

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGREEING WITH THE SENTIMENT OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE PAUL SIMON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 489.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 489, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 0, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—394

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance

Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert

Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono

Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)

McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon

Kucinich
Marshall
Miller, George
Nadler
Platts
Rahall
Reyes
Serrano
Sherman
Tauzin
Walden (OR)
Watson
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1308

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, I would have voted "yes" on each (H.R. 492, H.R. 491, H.R. 490, H.R. 489) but I was unavoidably detained in a meeting concerning our effort in Iraq and Afghanistan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to a scheduling conflict, I was unable to be in Washington, DC, during rollcall votes 2 through 5. Had I been here I would have voted "yea"; for rollcall vote 2, "yea" for rollcall vote 3, "yea" for rollcall vote 4, and "yea" for rollcall vote 5.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, being detained in my district today on official business, had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall 2, H. Res. 492, Honoring the contributions of Catholic education, "yes"; rollcall 3, H. Res. 491, Regarding the benefits of mentoring, "yes"; rollcall 4, H. Res. 490, Recognizing the achievements of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the Mars Exploration Rover Mission, "yes"; and rollcall 5, H. Res. 489, Honoring the late Senator Paul Simon, "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably absent from the Chamber today during rollcall votes 2, 3, 4, and 5. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 2, "yea" on rollcall 3, "yea" on rollcall 4, and "yea" on rollcall 5.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 21, I was unavoidably detained in my congressional district and was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On H. Res. 492, Honoring the contributions of Catholic schools, I would have voted "yea"; on H. Res. 491, Honoring Individuals Who are Mentors and Supporting Efforts to Recruit More Mentors, I would have voted "yea"; on H. Res. 490, Recognizing and Commending the Achievements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I would have voted "yea"; and on H. Res. 489, Stating the Agreement of the House of Representatives with the Sentiment Expressed by the Senate in Senate Resolution 281, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 20, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 1, the House Quorum Call. Had I been present, I would have voted "present" for rollcall vote No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 21, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 2, Honoring Catholic schools, rollcall vote No. 3, Benefits of mentoring, rollcall vote No. 4, Recognizing NASA's Jet Propulsion Lab and Mars Rover Mission, and rollcall vote No. 5, Expressing sorrow and respect for former Senator Paul Simon. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall votes No. 2-5.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Financial Services, the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 20, 2004.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective January 20, 2004, I hereby resign from the Committee on Financial Services, the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Small Business due to my pending appointment to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 495) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 495

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Gonzalez.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW RANKING MINORITY MEMBER ON COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate, on behalf of all the members of the Democratic Caucus, our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), whom the Democratic Caucus elected as the new ranking member on the Committee on Science. He is a proven leader on the Committee on Science and within this body, and I know that he will serve our Nation well in his new capacity.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules, and a final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of this week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday, the House will convene at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We plan to consider S. 1920, which extends Chapter 12 of the Federal Bankruptcy Code until July 1, 2004. In addition, we hope to consider S. 610, which

would provide some important management reforms at NASA.

Finally, it is my understanding that our colleagues in the Senate are likely to pass the omnibus appropriations bill, possibly as early as tomorrow. However, I would like to make all Members aware that if the Senate does not act, we may be forced to move a long-term continuing resolution next week, as the present continuing resolution we are operating on expires at the end of next week.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and would be happy to answer any questions he may have.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the leader for that information.

Mr. Majority Leader, when the Congress adjourned for the year last year, it failed to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program, leaving 90,000 American workers and their families every week, roughly one-half million workers by the end of this month, in the lurch. We have 200 Democrats who have signed a discharge petition that would bring to the floor legislation to extend this much-needed help to those workers.

Can the majority leader tell the House, tell all of us when he will schedule debate on this important matter?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I continue to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

As the gentleman knows, he was here last night, the President mentioned last night that the third-quarter economic growth in 2003 was the strongest in 20 years and that housing starts and home ownership rates are up and at an all-time high; that financial markets are growing, after a long contraction; that interest rates are low; that factory orders are up; that unemployment is on the decline. Unemployment benefit claims have decreased actually every month since September, and the unemployment rate today is 5.7 percent, which is almost a full percentage point lower than the rate that we had in 1994 when a Democrat Congress and a Democrat President discontinued an expanded unemployment compensation program.

So with a growing economy and a recent precedent for managing these scenarios, it is clear to the majority that the best employment program is to keep growing jobs and paychecks instead of extending and expanding Federal programs.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, is the majority leader telling us there is not a need to bring this legislation to the floor of the House for a vote when more than 200 Democratic Members have signed a discharge petition?

Mr. DELAY. The last time I checked, Mr. Speaker, 218 is a majority.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate the distinguished leader's response in regards to this issue.

Let me just point out, if I might, that we now have 300,000 fewer people that are seeking employment because they have given up, and that brings down the unemployment rate when in reality it is higher than it has ever been. And the last time we did not extend the unemployment, the last recession, we did that when there was a significant growth in employment. We have had 1,000 new jobs created in the last month. We have a net loss of over 2.4 million jobs in the last 3 years.

I would just urge the distinguished leader to talk to members of both caucuses. This is an important issue. There are a lot of people who are being lost in this economy that need this help. And I would just urge the leader to consider scheduling debate on the floor on the extension of the Federal unemployment accounts. We have bills sponsored by both Democrats and Republicans on this issue. It is an important subject. And I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding to me.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, January 23, 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 2004 TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, January 23, 2004, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 27, 2004, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF HONORABLE MAC THORNBERRY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JANUARY 27, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 21, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through January 27, 2004.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

□ 1315

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REGARDING THE NEW MEDICARE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in last year's State of the Union address, President Bush called Medicare "the binding commitment of a caring society." Last night in his State of the Union address, the President said the Medicare prescription drug bill that was enacted last year "kept a basic commitment to our seniors."

The new Medicare law kept a basic commitment all right, but as the tens of thousands of seniors who have quit AARP would likely agree, the commitment was not to America's seniors. The new Medicare law means an additional \$139 billion in profit to the drug industry over the next 8 years. The President did fulfill his commitment, a commitment he had to the drug industry. The new Medicare bill the President signed means an additional \$14 billion in subsidies to the insurance industry over the next 10 years, again a commitment the President fulfilled to his insurance company backers and contributors. But the President's commitment meant virtually nothing to seniors, many of whom will not have access to any benefit until 2006 and after that will have access to only a very inadequate drug benefit. The new benefit will cover less than half of a senior's drug costs. The average senior would do better traveling to Canada to purchase her prescription drugs. Of course the Bush administration has been busy pressuring Canadian pharmacies to stop selling medicine to American consumers.

Again, the President's commitment to the drug companies won out. The reason drug prices are lower in Canada is because the Canadian government negotiates price with the drug industry. But the new Medicare law expressly forbids the U.S. Government from negotiating with the drug industry to bring drug prices down. Get that. This new drug bill prohibits the government from using its buying power, representing 40 million Medicare beneficiaries, this new law prohibits the government from negotiating with the drug industry to bring prices down. That is why the drug industry's profits are set to explode under the President's new Medicare privatization bill. Again, it is a commitment not to America's seniors but a commitment President Bush made to his drug company contributors. If seniors had asked the President and the Congress to short-change them on drug coverage while giving the drug industry a free ride, it would be accurate to say that yes, he really has fulfilled his commitment to them, but that is clearly not what seniors asked us to do.

Medicare HMOs enjoyed a 118 percent increase in profits last year. Yet we are about to hand them an additional \$14.3 billion. According to the General Accounting Office, we already overpay HMOs by 20 percent. This new law will ensure we shower them with more money, we waste even more taxpayer dollars subsidizing the insurance industry, again a commitment to the insurance industry and the President's financial contributors in the insurance industry and HMOs, a commitment he made to them when they were so supportive in his campaign.

Mr. Speaker, in the end, we have a President who always consistently makes a choice. If it is a choice between corporate interests and the public interest, this President chooses corporate interests every single time.

AL QAEDA DEALS HEROIN TO FUND TERRORISM OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Pakistan's frontier where Osama bin Laden is likely hiding. We describe bin Laden as a terrorist. While that label applies, I think we can be more accurate. He has become a narco-terrorist.

During my mission, I learned that bin Laden's source of donated funds has been reduced. In response, bin Laden has become one of Pakistan's top heroin dealers. Kandahar trafficker Haji Bashir Noorzai provides 1,000 kilograms of heroin each month to bin Laden's organization. That provides al Qaeda with \$24 million a year to fund his attacks against the West.

If we are to catch bin Laden and to wrap up his organization, we must attack his new source of income, heroin.

This triggers a change in the policy of the international coalition fighting al Qaeda. We should make this change. We should raise the rewards for catching bin Laden and attack his heroin organization.

There are at least three major drug trafficking organizations now operating in Afghanistan, all with links to Pakistan: The Taliban, the HIG and bin Laden's al Qaeda. Last week, coalition forces made their first effort and hit a major drug lab in eastern Afghanistan that captured \$100 million worth of heroin that could have supported terror against the West.

Next week, I will be offering legislation to increase the rewards for the capture of terrorists but to also expand the rewards program to involve the rewards program in capturing narco-terrorists, and also to loosen up that rewards program so that we can provide valuable commodities which speak much more directly to the rural families in Pakistan and Afghanistan, providing, for example, motorcycles, farm implements or trucks for the capture of these well-known terrorists. The terrorists are changing their source of financing and the United States needs to change its strategy to dry up that financing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ISSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHUSTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTRODUCTION OF UNITED STATES SEAPORT MULTIYEAR SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the President's message last night on the critical need for security enhancement around our seaports and airports, I am introducing legislation today, the United States Seaport Multiyear Security

Enhancement Act, and I ask all of my colleagues to support it. This is a bipartisan issue. Seaport security continues to be an ongoing national concern that Congress cannot afford to ignore any longer.

The United States Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act is much-needed legislation that seeks to provide a steady, predictable stream of funding for port security projects. In short, this legislation creates a port security grant program within the Homeland Security Department. Our Nation's 361 seaports are considered a major terrorist target. It is known that al Qaeda has strong ties to the shipping industry and that one of the aims of this terrorist network is to weaken the economic security of our country. Our Nation's coastline is our longest border, which is a 95,000-mile coast that includes the Great Lakes and inland waterways.

Protecting America's seaports is critical to the Nation's economic growth, vitality and security. Seaports handle 95 percent of our Nation's overseas trade by volume, support the mobilization and deployment of U.S. Armed Forces and serve as transit points for millions of cruise and ferry passengers. Maritime industries contribute \$742 billion per year to the U.S. gross national product.

The United States Coast Guard has issued final regulations that call for immediate and long-term investment in securing our seaports. According to the U.S. Coast Guard, implementing these regulations that directly address our seaport security needs will cost \$1.125 billion in the first year and \$5.45 billion over 10 years. To date, security funding to our seaports has been woefully underfunded. Congress has provided \$442 million in seaport security funding through three rounds of competitive grant funding and from the Office of Domestic Preparedness. Given our Nation's economic dependence on our seaports and our ongoing national security concerns, Mr. Speaker, seaport security funding and the need for Federal support for our Nation's security should be ongoing.

Given the enormity of these seaport capital infrastructure projects, my legislation seeks to do the following: Establish a multiyear seaport grant program that resembles the letter of intent measures established in the aviation security program. And it calls for multiyear grants and \$800 million per year for port security grant funding. The program would be authorized for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is much needed. According to the Department of Homeland Security, to date, \$1 out of every \$10 requested for port security grants is funded. That is one out of 10. The continuing security and economic needs that face our Nation and our seaports should be recognized by the establishment of the U.S. Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act, the legislation that I am introducing

today. I ask all of my colleagues for their support of this very important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DO NOT TRIVIALIZE NEED TO INTERNATIONALIZE IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night in his State of the Union address to the Nation, President Bush attempted to deride critics who have called upon him to broaden the coalition and internationalize the effort to provide security to Iraq and rebuild that war-torn nation. The President said, "This particular criticism is hard to explain to our partners in Britain." And then he named 15 other countries and cited 17 others.

I respect the contributions that these other nations have made in Iraq, some of which like Spain, Italy and Japan have also lost sons to the war in Iraq.

But let us not be disingenuous on the subject of our allies in Iraq. With the exception of the United Kingdom, none are engaged in the arduous combat-related work that confronts the 130,000 American troops in Iraq who have endured over 500 dead and thousands of wounded among their ranks. And none carry the financial burden that the American taxpayer provides for the security of Iraq. President Bush should not trivialize the need to create a genuine international coalition capable of sharing the burdens of building a safe, secure and democratic Iraq.

I would like to have heard President Bush talk about how the United States needs the help, support and expertise of the United Nations, which has also paid in blood for our Iraq policy to ensure that the democracy-building and election process in Iraq are inclusive and successful. I would have liked to have heard President Bush talk about how the international community could help in the prosecution of Saddam Hussein so that his trial has credibility both inside and outside Iraq. I would have liked to have heard just one word from President Bush that indicates that he gets it, that he understands the United States must work with allies, NATO and the United Nations in order to secure the manpower and money necessary for a secure and stable Iraq. Certainly those of us concerned about the resources of our Federal budget understand this as we prepare to receive another supplemental spending request for at least \$50 billion sometime later this year. That is \$50 billion in addition to the more than \$120 billion we have already spent so far on Iraq over the last year.

And, most of all, our troops on the ground understand this, including the members and families of our National Guard and Reserves who have served so valiantly, despite open-ended deployments and equipment shortages. But President Bush simply does not get it and last night he outlined how he will stay on the same go-it-alone course that has so alienated the rest of the world, diminished the credibility of U.S. foreign policy and intelligence, undermined international institutions, and left us resented rather than respected.

I do not believe the United States needs a permission slip to act when our security is genuinely threatened, but we now know that with Iraq, our security was never in imminent danger. There were no weapons of mass destruction. Instead, last night the President talked about "weapons of mass destruction-related program activities," whatever that means. There were no ties to Osama bin Laden, whose name the President never even mentioned last night.

□ 1330

There was only a driving hunger to overthrow the Iraqi regime from the moment this administration entered the White House.

The unilateral and arrogant way in which the Bush administration has handled the Iraq war and its aftermath has resulted in a U.S. occupation that has cost us dearly in terms of human life and precious resources. It would have been nice if the President had even acknowledged last night the 500 American soldiers who have sacrificed their lives in Iraq and the thousands more who have been wounded.

Mr. Speaker, the exaggeration and the manipulation of intelligence and our changing rationales for our involvement have diminished the credibility and standing of the United States around the globe in ways that I truly believe undermine our security. Now we have a moral obligation to rebuild Iraq and to safeguard the Iraqi people, and we can only do that successfully with the help and support of the United Nations and the broader international community. It would have been nice if President Bush had taken just a few seconds in an hour-long speech to acknowledge that reality last night.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 2004]

ARMS ISSUE SEEN AS HURTING U.S.

CREDIBILITY ABROAD

(By Glenn Kessler)

The Bush administration's inability to find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq—after public statements declaring an imminent threat posed by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein—has begun to harm the credibility abroad of the United States and of American intelligence, according to foreign policy experts in both parties.

In last year's State of the Union address, President Bush used stark imagery to make the case that military action was necessary. Among other claims, Bush said that Hussein had enough anthrax to "kill several million people," enough botulinum toxin to "subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure" and enough chemical agents to "kill untold thousands."

Now, as the president prepared for this State of the Union address Tuesday, those frightening images of death and destruction have been replaced by a different reality: Few of the many claims made by the administration have been confirmed after months of searching by weapons inspectors.

Within the United States, Bush does not appear to have suffered much political damage from the failure to find weapons, with polls showing high ratings for his handling of the war and little concern that he misrepresented the threat.

But a range of foreign policy experts, including supporters of the war, said the long-term consequences of the administration's rhetoric could be severe overseas—especially because the war was waged without the backing of the United Nations and was opposed by large majorities, even in countries run by leaders that supported the invasion.

"The foreign policy blow-back is pretty serious," said Kenneth Adelman, member of the Pentagon's Defense Advisory Board and a supporter of the war. He said the gaps between the administration's rhetoric and the postwar findings threaten Bush's doctrine of "preemption," which envisions attacking a nation because it is an imminent threat.

The doctrine "rests not just on solid intelligence," Adelman said, but "also on the credibility that the intelligence is solid."

Already, in the crisis over North Korea's nuclear ambitions, China has rejected U.S.

intelligence that North Korea has a secret program to enrich uranium for use in weapons. China is a key player in resolving the North Korean standoff, but its refusal to embrace the U.S. intelligence has disappointed U.S. officials and could complicate negotiations to eliminate North Korea's weapons programs.

Richard Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, said the same problem could occur if the United States presses for action against alleged weapons programs in Iran and Syria. The solution, he said, is to let international organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency take the lead in making the case, as has happened thus far in Iran, and also to be willing to share more of the intelligence with other countries.

The inability to find suspected weapons "has to make it more difficult on some future occasion if the United States argues the intelligence warrants something controversial, like a preventive attack," said Haass, a Republican who was head of policy planning for Secretary of State Colin L. Powell when the war started. "The result is we've made the bar higher for ourselves and we have to expect greater skepticism in the future."

James Steinberg, a deputy national security adviser in the Clinton administration who believed there were legitimate concerns about Iraq's weapons programs, said the failure of the prewar claims to match the postwar reality "add to the general sense of criticism about the U.S., that we will do anything, say anything" to prevail.

Indeed, whenever Powell grants interviews to foreign news organizations, he is often hit with a question about the search for weapons of mass destruction. Last Friday, a British TV reporter asked whether in retirement he would "admit that you had concerns about invading Iraq," and a Dutch reporter asked whether he ever had doubts about the Iraq policy.

"There's no doubt in my mind that he had the intention, he had the capability," Powell responded. "How many weapons he had or didn't have, that will be determined."

Some on Capitol Hill believe the issue is so important that they are pressing the president to address the apparent intelligence failure in the State of the Union address and propose ways to fix it.

"I believe that unanswered questions regarding the accuracy and reliability of U.S. intelligence have created a credibility gap and left the nation in a precarious position," Rep. Jane Harman (Calif.), the senior Democrat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, said in a speech last week. "The intelligence community seems to be in a state of denial, and the administration seems to have moved on."

Since last year's State of the Union, the White House has established procedures for handling intelligence in presidential speeches by including a CIA officer in the speech-writing process. The CIA is also conducting an internal review, comparing prewar estimates with postwar findings, and the final report will be finished after inspectors in Iraq complete their work.

But Bush and his aides have largely sought to divert attention from the issue. White House aides have said they expect this year's State of the Union speech to look ahead—to the democracy the administration hopes to establish in Iraq—rather than look back.

Officials also have turned the focus to celebrating Hussein's capture last month and repeatedly drawing attention to Hussein's mistreatment of his people. Officials have argued that if Iraq's stocks of weapons are still unclear, Hussein's intentions to again possess such weapons are not. Thirteen years ago, when the United States was a backer of

Hussein, Iraq used chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war.

The administration "rid the Iraqi people of a murderous dictator, and rid the world of a menace to our future peace and security," Vice President Cheney said in a speech last week. Cheney—and other U.S. officials—increasingly point to Libya's decision last month to give up its weapons of mass destruction as a direct consequence of challenging Iraq.

Bush, when asked by ABC's Diane Sawyer why he said Iraq had weapons of mass destruction when intelligence pointed more to the possibility Hussein would obtain such weapons, dismissed the question: "So, what's the difference?"

The U.S. team searching for Iraq's weapons has not issued a report since October, but in recent weeks the gap between administration claims and Iraq's actual weapons holdings has become increasingly clear. The Washington Post reported earlier this month that U.S. investigators have found no evidence that Iraq had a hidden cache of old chemical or biological weapons, and that its nuclear program had been shattered after the 1991 Persian Gulf War. A lengthy study issued by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace also concluded the administration shifted the intelligence consensus on Iraq's weapons in 2002 as officials prepared for war, making it appear more imminent and threatening than was warranted by the evidence.

The report further said that the administration "systematically misrepresented the threat" posed by Iraq, often on purpose, in four ways: one, treating nuclear, chemical and biological weapons as a single threat, although each posed different dangers and evidence was particularly thin on Iraq's nuclear and chemical programs; two, insisting without evidence that Hussein would give his weapons to terrorists; three, often dropping caveats and uncertainties contained in the intelligence assessments when making public statements; and four, misrepresenting inspectors' findings so that minor threats were depicted as emergencies.

Jessica T. Mathews, president of the Carnegie Endowment and co-author of the report, pointed to one example in a speech delivered by Bush in Cincinnati on Oct. 7, 2002. U.N. inspectors had noted that Iraq had failed to account for bacterial growth media that, if used, "could have produced about three times as much" anthrax as Iraq had admitted. But Bush, in his speech, turned a theoretical possibility into a fact.

"The inspectors, however, concluded that Iraq had likely produced two to four times that amount," Bush said. "This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for and is capable of killing millions."

Mathews said her research showed the administration repeatedly and frequently took such liberties with the intelligence and inspectors' findings to bolster its cases for immediate action. In the Cincinnati example, "in 35 words, you go from probably to a likelihood to a fact," she said. "With a few little changes in wording, you turn an 'if' into a dire biological weapons stockpile. Anyone hearing that must be thinking, 'My God, this is an imminent threat.'"

Steinberg, who was privy to the intelligence before President Bill Clinton left office, said that while at the National Security Council he saw no evidence Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program, but that there were unresolved questions about Hussein's chemical and biological weapons programs. "Given his reluctance to address these questions, you had to conclude he was hiding something," he said, adding that given the intelligence he saw, "I certainly expected something would have turned up."

"I think there are [diplomatic] consequences as a result of the president asking these questions [about Iraq's weapons holdings] and the answer being no" weapons, said Danielle Pletka, vice president for foreign and defense policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute, who believes the ouster of Hussein justified the war. "The intelligence could have been better."

Richard Perle, another member of the Defense Advisory Board, said the criticism of the Bush administration is unfair. "Intelligence is not an audit," he said. "It's the best information you can get in circumstances of uncertainty, and you use it to make the best prudent judgment you can."

He added that presidents in particular tend not to place qualifiers on their statements, especially when they are advocating a particular policy. "Public officials tend to avoid hedging," he said.

Given the stakes involved—going to war—Mathews said the standards must be higher for such statements. "The most important call a president can make by a mile is whether to take a country to war," she argued, making the consequences of unwise decisions or misleading statements even greater.

Indeed, she said, the reverberations are still being felt, even as the administration tries to put the problem behind it. A recent CBS poll found that only 16 percent of those surveyed believed the administration lied about Iraq's weapons. But she said there is intense interest in the report's findings, with 35,000 copies downloaded from the think tank's Web site in just five days. "It is too soon to say there was no cost" to the failure to find weapons, she said. "I think there is a huge appetite for learning about this."

SOLUTIONS FOR SKYROCKETING HEALTH CARE COSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last year's 9½ percent increase in health care spending and costs was the largest in 11 years. Our health care spending per capita doubles that of European nations; yet 43 million Americans have no health care coverage and millions more receive inadequate care.

Many Americans listened to the State of the Union address last night in hopes of hearing solutions to skyrocketing prescription drug costs and insurance costs, driven largely by the uninsured who show up in hospitals and emergency rooms seeking care, forcing all of us who do have health care to pay what I call an uninsured premium, which is one of the great causes of our health care inflation in this country.

Unfortunately, the President's speech did not propose new ways to tackle these problems. The President touted his Medicare bill but ignored the fact that that bill does nothing to address skyrocketing prescription drug prices. We pay in this country 40 to 50 percent more than Canadians and Europeans pay for the same prescription drugs.

To address the worsening problem of the uninsured, the President referred again to a refundable tax credit worth \$1,000. The reality is in the market-

place it is impossible to find plans, individual plans, for \$1,000 worth of any health care coverage, coverage none of us in Congress would take at all.

Until we commit ourselves to market-based solutions that embrace the principle of competition and choice, we will not bring down health care prices and costs. Access problems will only get worse for the uninsured and insured.

By asking our taxpayers to spend \$400 billion on a Medicare prescription drug bill while paying the most expensive prices in the world, we are short-changing our seniors, and we are short-changing our taxpayers. They deserve the common decency and courtesy to get the best prices in the world, not the most expensive prices.

By not taking steps to lower all health insurance costs through market-based, cost-effective solutions, we are compromising the care all Americans receive who are struggling to try to pay for the premium increases and cost increases in their health care system.

Prescription drug spending increased by 15.3 percent in 2003. In Europe, where there is competition and choice for medications, prices on average are 40 percent below what they are here in the United States. In every other industry, food, software, cars, consumer electronics, worldwide competition keeps prices down here in the United States; yet for pharmaceutical drugs, we have a closed market, and we pay the most expensive prices in the world.

Polls show that more than two thirds of Americans think they should be able to purchase drugs from Canada and Europe; yet the final Medicare bill did not include these provisions. President Bush should work with Congress this year to lower prescription drug prices through greater reliance on competition and market forces and not threaten to veto such legislation. To do this, we should continue to work for market access legislation similar to the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act, which passed the House last year.

We should also expand the limited provisions in the Medicare bill to increase access to generics. We should remove the provision on the Medicare bill that prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from doing both negotiation, setting up a Sam's Club-like entity of Medicare and using the 41 million seniors who purchase prescription drugs to reduce prices, just like the Veterans Administration and just like private plans.

The other major skyrocketing health care cost for the rest of us is the uninsured, and this is not just a problem for the poor. The fastest-growing group of people who are working without health care are people who earn \$50,000 to \$75,000 a year. The uninsured in this country who work is a middle-class problem.

Today, all insured Americans pay an uninsured premium in their taxes and their insurance policies, but all the

while the uninsured go without coverage. By addressing the health care needs of the uninsured, the entire system will work more efficiently, more cost effectively. Instead of trying to solve this problem with a tax credit that forces the uninsured to shop in the inefficient and expensive individual market, we should shape a policy for the uninsured around the principles of market competition.

I will propose legislation this year that provides the uninsured a voucher, a health care voucher, to purchase health insurance through a subsidiary of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, the same program where Members of Congress and the United States Senate and members of the administration get their health care. This plan will use the efficiencies of the group health insurance market to provide comprehensive insurance and reduce prices, while giving people a voucher. It also will keep the prices in a competitive range to the tax credit the President proposed.

There is nothing wrong with the health care system that competition and choice cannot fix.

THE WAR IN IRAQ AND WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, last night the President gave his State of the Union address to the Nation and to the Congress; and he brought up, rather surprisingly, weapons of mass destruction. The President said that American inspectors have "identified dozens of weapons of mass destruction-related program activities" in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what a weapons of mass destruction-related program activity is. I would like to find out. I do know this: it is not weapons of mass destruction. We have not found weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. David Kay, the American inspector, has not found them. The international inspectors did not find them.

Like many Members of this House, I voted in favor of the war in Iraq. I did so in order to disarm Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction. I am glad that we have defeated Hussein. I am glad he is in our custody. We and the Iraqi people are better off with him in custody. He was a murderous tyrant. But we have not found the weapons of mass destruction, and it is clear that an extraordinary amount of exaggeration and deception occurred from the White House on the subject of weapons of mass destruction before we went to war in order to win congressional support for going to war.

The President talked last night about our international coalition. The President would like us to believe that we have a broad-based and effective international coalition in Iraq to move forward with securing what is still an

unstable country and to move forward with reconstruction. He listed a long number of nations that have supplied some number of troops to the efforts in Iraq.

The fact is that well over 90 percent of the troops in Iraq are American. About 95 percent of the money being spent in Iraq is American taxpayer dollars, well over \$160 billion to date. The fact is that we did not turn effectively to our traditional and historic allies and move forward with the international community in order to build a coalition to defeat Hussein in Iraq.

The President, when he won his authority to go to war, made a number of commitments. He said that he would exhaust diplomatic options before going to war. He did not. He said he would allow the international inspectors the opportunity to complete their work in Iraq. He did not. He said he would go to the United Nations and build a coalition, and he did not. And now the President would still have us believe that we are on a successful hunt and are turning up weapons of mass destruction in Iraq as part of a broad-based coalition in that country, and neither of those statements is true.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the arrogance, the unilateralism, and the cowboy diplomacy of the President and the White House have made our challenges in Iraq much harder than they should have been and have made our war on al Qaeda and terror riskier and harder than it should be.

JOB CREATION AND THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last evening the President of our country addressed us here in the House Chamber, and it is always a great historic moment when that happens. But subsequent to his address, he left on Air Force One this morning for our home district and landed there at taxpayer expense in Air Force One, 6 weeks before the Ohio primary. With his campaign coffers loaded, I am a bit surprised that he did not use campaign funds for his visit today. He moved from the Toledo Express Airport to Owens Community College in order to talk about worker training or job training, which is one of the topics that the President addressed in his address last night. And one of the questions I would ask the President is his administration has cut job-training funds over the last 3 years and though Ohioans welcome any job-training funds this administration finally sees the light of day to produce, I am wondering if the President could not also concentrate on job creation so that jobs are there for workers who receive the training.

It was somewhat ironic that in this morning's Toledo Blade, the major

daily in the region, it was pointed out that though the President is talking about job training at Owens College, the headline reads "Owens lays off training employees before Bush's visit," and one of the several workers who has been handling workforce development at Owens College says she has worked there for 7 years and has been given a pink slip and is this not ironic. Another worker says, "I've been informed that my position has been eliminated." She had been employed at the college for 25 years and started there as a student in 1978. She said, "I'm 5 years from retirement. I really had thought after all this time I'd finish my career at the college and I'd still be a benefit" to the college. "It's just really hard for me to believe."

The other names of those who have been pink-slipped at Owens College I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This morning, as the President spoke, in his remarks he talked about job training. And Terry Thomas, the executive director of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges, which represents Owens College along with 23 other technical and community colleges in the State, added that there has been little funding for workforce development in Ohio; so any money from the government would help.

I would also like to place in the RECORD that the Bush administration and the Taft administration, both Republican administrations, have had a devastating impact on the State of Ohio where we have had now over 300,000 people out of work and 167,000 manufacturing jobs just in the last 3 years disappear from our State; and while all this is happening, hundreds of millions of dollars that I have voted for here in Congress have not been used by the State of Ohio. Indeed, there is over \$242 million still available for job training and workforce development on deposit here with the Federal Government under programs that have been severely cut back by this administration, and the State of Ohio is not spending those dollars. There are severe problems in Ohio, and it is one of the reasons that Owens College cannot do as good a job as it might do simply because of poor performance by our State government as well as cutbacks in these workforce development programs here at the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration nationwide has the worst record of job creation since Herbert Hoover, since the Great Depression.

□ 1345

Over 2,700,000 Americans are without work today. The President did not even use the words "extending unemployment benefits" in his remarks last night. What a tragedy.

Few States have been more severely impacted by the failed Bush administration policies than our State of Ohio. So it is an honor for us to receive a President of the United States, but,

really, he should be coming to help us. He should be coming to release the dollars that I had voted for here at the Federal level, and, most of all, helping us with job creation.

He is landing in a major corn producing State in Ohio. He could be helping us with transitioning America to fuel independence. Our farmers want to build ethanol plants and biodiesel plants in order to help this Nation break its dangerous addiction on foreign petroleum. Why does he not help us? When over 60 percent of the petroleum that fires this economy is imported from some of the most dangerous places in the world, we need his help.

Our State has been devastated by Republican economic policies at the national level and at the State level. Community after community has seen its jobs destroyed. The soaring Federal budget deficit and unemployment ranks deserve the President's attention. I am just so sorry he could not help us with job creation and work-force development when he visited our district today.

[From the Toledo Blade, Jan. 21, 2004]

OWENS LAYS OFF TRAINING EMPLOYEES
BEFORE BUSH'S VISIT
(By Ryan E. Smith)

Just days before President Bush's visit today to Owens Community College to tout job training programs at such two-year schools, at least six Owens employees who handle work-force development have been given pink slips, The Blade has learned.

The timing of the news, so near the presidential visit and expected speech about proposed federally funded job training grants for community colleges, was not lost on Kathy Munger.

Ms. Munger, who has worked at Owens for seven years, is one of those given a pink slip. "It's very ironic," she said.

Although some of those who received the two-week notices on Friday may be able to relocate in other departments, Ms. Munger, a training coordinator, and three other employees interviewed by The Blade said they will no longer have jobs.

"I've been informed that my position has been eliminated," said Pam Pullella, director of special projects who has been employed at the college for 25 years and started there as a student in 1978.

"I'm five years from retirement," she said, "I really had thought that after all this time I'd finish my career at the college, and I'd still be a benefit. It's just really hard for me to believe."

Others with the college's Center for Development and Training who confirmed to The Blade that they have received pink slips were Dr. Joseph Conrad, director of health and wellness; Jim Kronberg, director of spatial projects; Donna Brecht, records specialist, and Veronica Rice, records specialist. All work on the Perrysburg Township campus except for Mrs. Brecht and Ms. Rice, who are part of the college's Findlay operation.

Owens President Christa Adams called the personnel action a "realignment," but could not say last night whether any of the movement would result in layoffs.

She and other officials were busy preparing for the President's visit and could not be reached for further comment.

Earlier in the day, Owens officials refused to discuss any of its work-force programs with The Blade.

The affected employees who spoke with The Blade said they believe the cuts at the Center for Development and Training are not the only ones to occur at the college. They said they were given no reason other than restructuring.

Dr. Conrad, who has been at the college for almost eight years, said he worries about whether the programs will be able to function adequately with the reduction in personnel.

"It has to be detrimental," he said. "We don't have the manpower to continue the level of service to the community."

Mrs. Brecht, 40, who said she helps put together classes and make sure there are enough instructors, indicated the move will leave Findlay's Center for Development and Training with only half its manpower. She said she will not be bumped to a new position because she is the "low man on the totem pole."

TOLEDO, OHIO.—President Bush promoted his job-creation and worker-training goals Wednesday in Ohio—a state hit hard by manufacturing losses and one that is key to his 2004 campaign.

Hours after his State of the Union speech, Bush touted his proposal for new job-training grants channeled through community colleges at one of the state's fastest growing community colleges.

He called for \$250 million for programs to match workers and employers during his speech at Owens Community College.

"There's no better place to do that than the community college system," he said.

In addition to offering classes that help workers learn a new skill, community colleges often work with businesses to train their workers to use computer software or other skills.

"It's what we're all about," said Terry Thomas, executive director of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges, which represents 23 technical and community colleges.

But he added that there has been little funding for work force development, so any money from the government would help.

Owens Community College has seen its enrollment increase for 26 consecutive semesters. It now has about 40,000 full- and part-time students at its campuses in Toledo and Findlay.

Job training and counterterrorism proposals were among several plans Bush said Tuesday night that he would offer in his 2005 budget—a blueprint to be released Feb. 2 that will be constrained by record deficits expected to approach \$500 billion this year.

Even as Democrats scrapped among themselves over who would oppose him in November, the State of the Union address touted his administration's successes: the toppling and capture of Saddam Hussein, revival of economic growth, and passage of major tax cuts and a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

The address contained few major new proposals, underlining the limitations of a budget burdened by deficits and a campaign year in which far-reaching legislative accomplishments probably will be hard to come by. After calling last week for a resumption of human flights to the moon and eventually sending astronauts to Mars and beyond, Bush didn't mention space exploration in his speech.

From Congress to the presidential campaign trail in New Hampshire, where next week's presidential primary will be held, Democrats balked. They said Bush had ignored the job losses, ballooning budget deficits, diplomatic reversals and growing ranks of Americans without health insurance that have characterized his administration.

Bush touted a cluster of issues sure to energize conservative voters who are the core of the Republican Party.

He said he would support a constitutional amendment defining marriage as being between a man and a woman if courts struck down a law mandating that. He asked lawmakers to renew expiring portions of the USA Patriot Act that strengthen the investigative reach of law enforcement agencies, double funds for abstinence education and codify his administration's award of federal grants to religious charities.

He also took a swipe at Democrats who have challenged the path he took in Iraq, who have said his tax cuts were an unnecessary boon to the rich and that his Medicare expansion and education initiatives were inadequate.

He said the nation needed to stay the course against terrorism and admonished those who would "turn back to the dangerous illusion that terrorists are not plotting and outlaw regimes are no threat to us."

"We have not come all this way—through tragedy and trial and war—only to falter and leave our work unfinished," the president said.

By far, the most expensive proposal in his speech was one he has made repeatedly: Making his already enacted cuts in personal income and other taxes permanent. That has a price tag estimated at \$2 trillion, and an uncertain fate in Congress, considering projections for year after year of huge budget deficits.

Bush also called for more money—likely to be relatively small amounts—for spreading democratic institutions abroad, helping students performing poorly in math and reading, training prisoners for future employment and testing for drugs in schools.

He proposed tax breaks to help low-income people afford health care, and renewed his call to let people divert part of their Social Security taxes into retirement accounts whose investment they would control.

Congress is unlikely to touch an overhaul of politically sensitive Social Security at least until next year, after the elections.

RESPONDING TO STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, like many of my Democratic colleagues this afternoon, would like to respond, if you will, to the President's State of the Union address, which, of course, he gave to the Nation last night from the House podium just right behind me here.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, thanks to what I consider extremist policies of President Bush and the Republican leadership here in Congress, the priorities of the American people, priorities of good jobs, better access to healthcare and the best education for our children, are not being addressed, either at the White House or here by the House Republican majority, and certainly the President's speech last night did nothing to convince me that any of these priorities will be addressed in the forthcoming year.

The problem, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is that President Bush and Congressional Republicans continue to cater to

America's elite, to the wealthy. There is no doubt our Nation's millionaires have fared well over the past 3 years under President Bush and the elite have seen their taxes dramatically cut. But the hard-pressed middle-class face a weak job market that, thanks to President Bush's economic priorities, show no signs of improving in the immediate future.

So even though the President talks about economic recovery, it may be economic recovery when you look at the stock market quotations, but it is not when you look at jobs and the possibility for real job creation that would actually help the average American.

The President's efforts to provide billions of dollars in tax breaks to our Nation's millionaires will saddle our children and my children with massive deficits. So not only is his policy not creating jobs, but his policy is creating more and more debt.

President Bush and the Congressional Republicans have squandered historic budget surpluses. When President Bush took office, we had a surplus for the first time under President Clinton. But because of the collapse of fiscal discipline, now we are faced with a \$5 trillion national debt over the next decade, which has been brought about, in my opinion, by President Bush and the Republican policies here in the Congress.

One only has to revisit the President's last two State of the Union addresses to realize how out of touch the President is with what policies will really jump-start our Nation's economy. I would like to spend a little time this afternoon trying to compare some of the statements that President Bush made in the last couple of State of the Unions before last night to try to point out how really out of touch he is, and how what he mentioned last night is not going to get us to where he says we are going to go.

Two years ago, President Bush touted his second round of tax cuts by declaring in his State of the Union address, "My economic security plan can be summed up with one word: Jobs."

Instead of creating jobs, on President Bush's watch, our Nation has witnessed the greatest job loss in a recovery since the Great Depression of the 1930s. A few months of modest job creation that we have had over the past few months cannot hide the abysmal performance of the labor market over the past 3 years.

According to a State of the Union report from the Center for American Progress, long-term unemployment is close to a 20-year high because the labor market is so weak. The labor force participation rate in December 2003, just this past December, was at its lowest level since December 1991, a dozen years ago.

At every turn, the President has passed up opportunities to pass what I call high-bang-for-the-buck stimulus to jump-start job creation, and instead favors inefficient, ineffective, long-term tax cuts for the most well-off.

If you really want to create jobs, then you use the Federal budget and the power of the Federal Government to stimulate and jump-start jobs, job creation. Instead, we have this inefficient, long-term tax cut proposal which, as you heard last night, the President wants to continue, and, according to the Center for American Progress again, the report, in 2002, with our economy in desperate need of a jump-start, the administration pushed to retroactively eliminate the corporate alternative minimum tax, a provision which would have provided a \$254 million tax break to Enron. But what did it do for job creation here in the U.S. for the average guy? Nothing.

Let us consider the words that President Bush spoke last year during his 2003 State of the Union address. Again, we are going to go back one year. He said, "We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other presidents and other generations."

That is what he said a year prior to last night. But, despite this promise, President Bush's policies over the last 3 years led our Nation to a record \$450 billion deficit. This deficit is a major problem in terms of job growth, job creation, and even the long-term stability of the economy. Everyone recognizes that the President and the Republicans pushed up the debt to unheard-of heights.

Again, I want to put this deficit problem in perspective, to go back to this report from the Center for American Progress. It found in the report that 5 years from now the average family's share of the national debt will be more than \$84,000, compared to a projected \$500 per family when Bush took office.

So when the President took office, the national debt, if you look at it per capita, was very low. We were actually in a surplus. We just had a national debt that had been inherited from before, but we were actually in a surplus. Now that national debt has grown to more than \$84,000 for the average family's share. It is an incredible figure when you think about it, and it makes it really impossible for us to talk about the Federal Government playing any kind of role to create jobs or to improve the economy when we have such a huge deficit.

Our Nation's fiscal situation is so dire that the International Monetary Fund issued an unusually strong and stark warning about the threat that rising fiscal and trade deficits in the U.S. pose to the financial stability of the world economy. This was just a couple weeks ago when the International Monetary Fund issued this warning.

In a departure from what he previously had said, the President last night, if you took notice, actually did say that the deficit was a problem. I think he finally came around to the point where he cannot just ignore it, because if you think about it, prior to last night he was saying, "Oh, it

doesn't matter. We can continue to have larger deficits, growing deficits. It doesn't make any difference."

But last night he finally acknowledged the fact that the deficit was a problem, and he did express concern over the size of the deficit and he basically reasserted his commitment to cut the deficit in half in the next 5 years.

But that is, again, his rhetoric. He is saying that, he is acknowledging for the first time in the last 3 years that the deficit is a problem, and he is saying he wants to cut it in half over the next 5 years, but if you look at the policies that President Bush put forward last night, the reality is they are only going to increase the deficit. They are not going to cut the deficit, they are going to increase the deficit.

Again if you go back to this report from the Center for American Progress, the President proposed at least \$3 trillion in new tax cuts last night and spending over the next few months. So between the tax cuts that he talked about last night and the new spending he talked about last night, we are talking about a huge increase in the deficit, not a decrease.

I can say that, and I would like to detail a little more this afternoon why I say that what he is proposing last night in terms of tax cuts and new spending is going to increase the deficit rather than cut it in half over the next 5 years.

First let us talk about the \$1 trillion proposal to privatize Social Security which the President mentioned. I have to tell you that I do not like the idea of privatizing Social Security in any way. I do not think the whole idea of privatizing Social Security is a good thing, but the President mentioned it, and I want to give you the fiscal consequences.

Partial Social Security privatization under the President's proposal last night would, all by itself, require at least \$1 trillion in extra funds over the next decade. That is from the New York Times yesterday, January 20.

What about the new tax cuts? The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the cost of President Bush's proposals last night to make his tax cuts permanent at roughly \$1 trillion. That is from the Washington Times, September of this year.

What about the mission to Mars? He did not mention in his speech last night the mission to Mars, but he has, over the last week, talked about how he wants to propose this mission to Mars. While the White House has tried to fudge the total cost of the Mars proposal, a similar proposal was floated way back in 1989, over 20 years ago, and at that time the cost was projected at \$400 billion to \$500 billion. With inflation, that is about \$600 to \$700 billion today. Again, where is that money going to come from, without us going further and further into debt?

He also proposed a missile defense system. Despite a GAO report advising against moving forward with an untested missile defense system, the Bush

administration is moving forward and they talk about a missile defense system that would cost as much as \$273 billion. That is from a GAO report of June earlier this year, the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

Also the war. Again, the President made his presentation about the war in Iraq and the war against terrorism and linked it to it. But on top of the \$166 billion already spent on the war in Iraq, the President is expected to propose a \$50 billion supplemental bill to pay for Iraqi war costs. The bill probably will not come up maybe until after the November election, but that is another \$50 billion for the war in Iraq, which, again, is costing us a tremendous amount of money and driving us further into debt.

Lastly, and I know in the scheme of things you might say this does not add up to much, it is only \$1.5 billion, but the President's proposal to promote marriage, Bush administration officials have been working with various conservative groups on this proposal, and it would provide at least \$1.5 billion for training to help couples develop interpersonal skills that sustain healthy marriages. That is from *The New York Times* last week.

Well, again, maybe \$1.5 billion does not sound like much in the scheme of things, but \$1.5 billion to promote marriage? Promotion of marriage is certainly a good thing, but do we have to spend \$1.5 billion and go further into deficit to promote marriage? I do not think so. I do not think that is a good expenditure of Federal funds.

So my point is, the President addressed the issue of the deficit last night. He said he is going to cut it in half over the next 5 years, but everything he proposed last night, tax cuts, spend in various areas, all adds up to a significant increase in the deficit. So the rhetoric does not go along with the reality.

How can the President say he plans to cut the deficit in half at the same time he proposes \$3 trillion in new tax cuts and spending? I think he has got to level with the American people. The only way he can really address the skyrocketing deficit is to roll back the components of his tax cuts that, again, as I said earlier, in my opinion, disproportionately benefit the very wealthiest.

The President's suggestion that his tax cuts have been only a minor factor in the fiscal deterioration, actually he said the opposite, that the tax cuts have been a factor in turning the economy around, I would say they have been actually a major factor in our fiscal deterioration and certainly in the deficit creation. They are the largest single contributor to the deterioration of our budget outlook.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the President's speech, keep these statements in mind about what he said in the past in his State of the Union versus what he is saying now, and I think he has a long way to go to prove

to the American people that his economic proposals will not only benefit the wealthy, but also middle-class Americans.

I wanted to spend a little time, I know some of my colleagues earlier this afternoon talked about the ill-fated Republican Medicare prescription drug bill, and, again, the President touted that last night and said how great a thing that was. I have to be honest and say that I think it was pretty obvious if you looked around the room last night, around the House Chambers, that his Medicare prescription drug bill fell on deaf ears.

Obviously since it was passed back in November and the President took it to the people, and our colleagues on both the Republican and Democratic side went home, they found, to no surprise of mine or most of the Democrats, that this was not a proposal that people felt was accomplishing anything, and, in fact, might actually hurt Medicare because of the effort to privatize.

□ 1400

So when the President talked about his prescription drug proposal last night, I noticed there was very few applause, even from the Republican side of the aisle; and I do not think anybody stood up. I think it is testimony of the fact that both sides of the aisle think it is not a good proposal and that the public does not like it.

Now, what is the reason? If we think about it, what they did was to suggest they were somehow giving people a prescription drug benefit when in reality what they were really doing was changing the Medicare program for the worse. If we look at the actual coverage for prescription drugs for seniors under that bill that was signed into law a month or so ago, it provides woefully inadequate prescription drug coverage.

There is a giant gap in coverage in which seniors receive no assistance with costs between \$2,200 and \$5,100 annually. About half of all seniors will not have any drug coverage for part of the year. It does nothing, the Republican Medicare bill does nothing to reduce the cost of prescription drugs. The bill prohibits Medicare from using the bargaining power of 40 million seniors to negotiate lower drug prices, which we are going to see as the drug companies continuing to reach huge profits, and yet seniors will continue to get the major price increases which at times have amounted to 18 percent annually on the drugs that they need just to remain healthy.

In addition, the Medicare bill forces seniors into private plans through either HMOs or PPOs. The other day the President announced he was going to give the HMOs and these private health plans a huge influx of money to try to entice them back into the Medicare program. But I have to tell my colleagues that in my own State of New Jersey, we have had 200,000 seniors in New Jersey that were dropped by HMOs

pursuant to Medicare in the time since the HMOs were allowed to participate in the Medicare program.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I think the bottom line is that we lost a tremendous opportunity last year to pass a prescription drug bill that would actually be meaningful for seniors. We as Democrats simply proposed expanding Medicare to include prescription drugs. One would stay in their traditional Medicare, one did not have to join an HMO, and we would expand Medicare in the same way that we provide coverage now under part B for doctor bills. One would simply pay \$25 a month. One would have a \$100 deductible. Twenty percent of the cost of drugs there would be a copay, and the other 80 percent would be paid for by the government. And the Democratic proposal would have specifically mandated that the administrator of the Medicare program bargain to reduce costs for prescription drugs to the average senior.

But we tried that. The Republicans rejected it. We are now faced with this essentially worthless Medicare bill that does not really do anything to help seniors with their drug bills.

The last thing I wanted to do today, and I see one of my colleagues is here and I would like to have him join me, but the last thing I wanted to say is in the time when we were back in our districts in December over the Christmas holiday and New Year's, the one issue that continued to rise to be brought to my attention, to be raised by my constituents was the increased cost of health insurance. We know that more and more Americans do not have health insurance; but even for those who do have coverage, because they get it on the job or if they have to buy it on their own, are very concerned about the rising costs and the fact that they may not be able to afford health insurance or their employer might not provide it in the future.

So that is why the President last night mentioned the crisis and said that there was a problem out there, but what he failed to mention is that the situation has gotten worse. There are about 4 million Americans that have lost their insurance coverage in the last 3 years since President Bush has been in office. If we think of what he proposed last night, a \$1,000 tax credit is really going to be meaningless for most of those who do not have insurance now. We know that if you do not have health insurance and you want to try to go out and buy it on the private market, a \$1,000 tax credit is not going to be any significant help to you.

So the President's proposals last night, whether they were the affiliated health plans or the tax credit, is basically the same old proposals that he has been shuffling around for the last 3 years or so; and they are not going to do the job of providing Americans with health coverage, neither those who do not have health insurance or those who are afraid of losing it.

Again, I worry, because I see the President talking about the problems that are out there, suggesting that somehow he is going to do something about it; but when we look at the specifics about what he is going to do or what he is proposing, it does not add up to any meaningful effort to provide health insurance, to increase the number of jobs, to reduce the deficit, all the things that are so much of a priority right now.

Mr. Speaker, I see my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, is here; and I would like to yield to him.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the President's State of the Union address last night. From where I was sitting, my perspective, I am from Michigan, from the northern half, and I was really surprised that the President never mentioned the urban areas of this country. About 60 percent of the people in this country live in cities. He did not articulate any type of a plan or approach to help those areas that are dealing with many, many problems. Especially since the National Conference of Mayors is in town this week, I thought at least there would be some mention about urban areas: what can we do to help them with their urban sprawl, with infrastructure needs, green space, or even just helping them cope with these homeland securities which cost these cities millions of dollars. When we get elevated from yellow to orange or orange to red, whatever system they are using now, it costs them a lot of money. The cities, like the States right now, are financially strapped for cash. How do they pay for this? If it is a requirement of the Federal Government, should we not just help them out? I was surprised that he did not touch on the cities.

I was also very, very surprised, and maybe it is the record of this administration, that he did not even mention veterans. Why would he not mention veterans? We are creating veterans every day in this country with the war in Afghanistan and Iraq, and he never even mentioned them. Probably because we saw proposed \$20 billion cuts in veterans health over the next 10 years; that is what his budget proposal shows. It would really eliminate and cap the number of veterans who can access the VA system. We have a cap on it right now because there is not enough money in the system. So maybe the President did not want to talk about veterans because his record in that area has not been very good.

So I would hope that we in this upcoming Congress can put a little more attention on the veterans issues. The Democratic Party and the Democrats in their response, and others, I saw coming up with bold new ideas on how to move this country forward. As the gentleman from New Jersey was saying, some of the stuff we have heard over the last 3 years was just warmed over and put in the State of the Union; but we have different ideas, bold ideas,

new ideas that I think are important. It would be my hope that in this session of Congress, Democrats and Republicans can work together to move forward some of these initiatives.

Some of the initiatives that the President did bring up did tweak my interest, let us say, like the health insurance. The gentleman and I both sit on the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and we have both spent a lot of time on that. Homeland security, I thought we would hear more about that, like fully equipping the first responders, the police, the fire, the emergency medical people.

Increased protection on the border. I come from northern Michigan, right there at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, crossing back and forth to Canada. Before September 11, most of our stations were not manned 24 hours a day. We have made some increases. We have more immigration officers, more Customs officials, more border patrols, they are all now under Homeland Security. But what happened was we put money out there to increase the number of people there; but last Labor Day, the first part of September, they were laying people off. They were supposed to be protecting our borders.

So I wish the President would have spent a little more time saying, look, there are some things we should do in homeland security, especially those of us who have a northern or southern border. It is critically important to us. We know all the cargo ships and containers that come into this country by ship or plane or trucks, we are only inspecting 2 to 3 percent of that cargo. We can do better than that with all of the modern technology and equipment we have. It does not cost that much.

There is no reason why we cannot implement a program. We have the technology. We sat through those hearings where they have shown us the technology to look for biological, radiological weapons and environmental weapons that may be in these containers. Why are we not doing it? If we want to talk about really being safe, that is one area we could improve. I mean, a 2 to 3 percent inspection, that means 97 to 98 are going through uninspected, really makes us susceptible to any kind of an attack, bioterrorist, chemical, or nuclear in this country.

So the Democrats have also put forth a proposal to do this, to increase that. That is not asking that much. We even know the cost of these machines, like big x-ray machines that can scan cargo holds and cargo containers. Why are we not talking about that if we want to really be secure here at home?

Taking a look at the economy and jobs, with all due respect to the President, more tax cuts is not going to solve this problem. In the last 3 years, if we take a look at the total package of the tax cuts that have been passed by this Congress, it is about \$2 trillion. And if they really created jobs, our

economy would not be in the slump we have.

Take my State of Michigan, we are a manufacturing State, and we have been hit terribly under these Bush economic policies. Since the President took office, and I am going back now to August of last year when they claimed we had this big increase in the third quarter of last year, well, in my State of Michigan we lost over 130 manufacturing jobs. They are not coming back. Those jobs like Electrolux in Greenville, Michigan, they are going south. They are going south of us. They are taking their tax cuts, and they are going to Mexico and other areas; and it is going to take out about 2,700 jobs in the little town of Greenville, Michigan. Throughout my district, there has been a number of them who have lost jobs. They go south. We have lost 130 manufacturing jobs. Let us face it, they are not coming back.

The President said, well, this tax increase would create these jobs. If we take a look at it, going back to my State of Michigan, 46 percent of the people received less than \$100 with the last Bush tax cut. How does that help anyone, and how does that create new jobs?

Mr. Speaker, we have so many needs in this country, and the Democrats have come up with a proposal to stimulate this economy, to get jobs moving. We actually put forth a proposal, never were we allowed to bring it to the floor for a vote, because the Democratic proposal was a good one. We supported targeted tax cuts. There should be some for middle class and working families, you bet you. We are there and willing to do it. But our economic and tax cut plan would have created 1 million jobs immediately. How were we going to do that? Invest back in our infrastructure, our port security that I spoke of; and we would have done this by taking money out of the trust funds and not add one penny to the deficit, not one penny to the deficit, but create a million jobs, invest here at home, invest in our airports, our water ports, to protect them from terrorism; and we could create jobs doing that; and, again, we would not have added anything to this deficit which is exploding out of sight.

Democrats do have a better way.

There are a number of things that we can and should be doing. We are willing to work with the President, but they also have to be willing to work with us. By that I mean the gentleman from New Jersey spoke a lot about the Medicare bill with the prescription drug plan. We notice when we had those hearings and we had, they call it the conference committee, no Democrats were ever invited to it; we were not even told when they were. So it was not like we got together; we were not even invited to the table to discuss it. In the House here, the person who probably knows more about Medicare and prescription drugs is the gentleman from my home State of Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). He has been here

and been involved in every Medicare bill since Medicare was created in 1965; he was not even included in the discussions or even asked his ideas.

So these proposals, we are willing to work with them, but they have to include us. The tax cut bills, we were not included on that. The Medicare bill, the energy bill which failed in the Senate, we were not included on that. We need better understanding, and we need a better working relationship with this White House and with the majority party in this Congress.

The gentleman from New Jersey mentioned prescription drugs and the Medicare plan. Just getting access to prescription drugs is a battle for many of us. If we take a look at it, our plan, the Democrat plan basically said, use the purchasing power of the Federal Government to help lower these costs; in fact, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Mr. Thompson, negotiate a lower drug price for us so we can pass it on to the 40 million recipients in Medicare so it does not cost them so much. The bill passed by Republicans expressly prohibited it. The bill also expressly prohibits the Secretary or average Americans from going to Canada or Europe to get lower cost prescription drugs.

□ 1415

One are forbidden from doing it. If one are really interested in lowering the cost for the American people and for our seniors, these two common sense approaches, why is not that part of the Medicare bill to keep the cost down?

And I bring up this Medicare and prescription drugs because the President said last night he will give tax incentives to help people to afford health insurance. Well, that is wonderful, but we need some incentives to keep those costs down. If he did not allow us to come together to lower the cost, negotiate lower prices for prescription drugs, is he really going to allow in the bill the associated health plans to allow businesses to come together to negotiate lower prices down? If we look at the track record, the answer is no. If we are not going to do it on prescription drugs, why would we suddenly want to do it on these associated health plans.

If one really takes a look at the associated health plans, why are they somewhat popular? Well, because underneath the associated health plans, there are two major problems. They do not necessarily come and band together. Each small business in that plan is its own entity and can lead it or drop it whenever they want. So we cannot guarantee that unity, the cohesiveness would stay there.

The second big problem with these associated health plans that the President brought up is that small employers, besides cut and run for a better deal, they do not have to follow state mandates. Every State says, look, if you offer health insurance in our

State, here are some basic rules you have to follow, basic things we want you to do: Prenatal coverage, mental health coverage, immunization coverage, emergency room access, things like that.

These associated health plans that the President brought up last night they do not have to do that. They work outside the State requirements. So they can pick and choose in this State we do not want to offer this or maybe we do not want to do a prenatal care. Maybe we do not want the mental health part of it.

So one is paying a lot of money for half a plan as dictated by the insurance industry and not the needs of the people in that State in which one is selling that insurance.

I like the ideas that the President brought up. If they are willing to work with us, I am sure we can work out some ideas. Democrats believe that a health care coverage plan should include all Americans. We believe the health care coverage should be continuous, that one is not wondering from year to year am I going to have the coverage, but there should be a continuation of coverage.

We believe health care coverage has to be affordable for families and individuals. We believe that health insurance should also be something as a society we all can afford.

And last, but not least, we should also make sure that health insurance actually promotes health and well-being like prevention programs, prenatal care, and access to high quality care that is effective, efficient, safe, timely, and patient-centered and is equitable, people are getting a reasonable return for the money they are spending on health insurance. I do not think that is asking too much.

These are some old ideas that are Democrats are willing to put forth: Accessible health insurance, affordable health insurance, make sure it is adequate to meet the needs of the society one is trying to serve and will always be there in the future so someone is not cut as soon as they have a claim.

So, again, we are willing to work with the President, but he has to reach out to include us.

It was interesting, we talked some more about it when the President was talking about the energy bill and how we should do this. And I think he said, if I quote him right, he said something like "I urge you to pass legislation to promote conservation." I notice he did not say, "I urge you to pass an energy bill that is also concerned about our environment." That was left out. I did not find the environment anywhere in the President's nine pages, this little book that we received with his remarks in there. Probably because in the last couple years, we have been fighting on the floor to keep a strong Clean Air Act, keep a Clean Water Act, protect our national forests and oppose drilling in ANWR and some of these other areas, and fully fund Superfund, which

cleans up and reinstates the polluter-pay principle, one of the things we all believe in.

But that Superfund, unfortunately, we used to get a royalty off the oil and gas drilling in this country and a percentage of that would go and fund Superfund. Well, since the new party took over, the majority took over in 1995, we have not put any money in the Superfund. And there are many Superfund sites in the Great Lake State of Michigan. We have many Superfund sites around the State, around our Great Lakes that should be cleaned up.

So if one is going to talk about energy policy, let us restore enough money for that energy policy. At least fund the Superfund to clean up Superfund sites and reinstate the polluter-pay principle. I think that is something we should all be able to agree with at least in principle.

I was disappointed also when the President said the No Child Left Behind Act is opening doors to opportunity to all of America's children. But as we know too often, and ask any school administrator, the Federal Government with the Leave No Child Behind did not fully fund it. For instance, Title I has a shortfall of billions of dollars.

If one takes a look at this last budget, to meet the requirements of this new testing that the President spoke of and all these other requirements that Leave No Child Behind Act, we should fund these programs. We are putting regulations on these schools. They are expected to perform, but yet they are not receiving Federal money to do this. While he may have increased funding for education, it has not kept pace with requirements that the Leave No Child Behind Act is requiring our schools to do. So we would like to see it fully funded.

And I also believe the other thing we should do if we are going to fully fund education from K through 12 is IDEA, Individual Disabilities Education Act. IDEA, the Federal Government passed that before this President was in office, and it was also a promise the Federal Government would fund it at 40 percent. At best, we are funding it at 18 to 19 percent. We are not even funding half of what we promised to fund when it came to K through 12 education. So, again, I think the ideas are there, but one has to put the funding there.

If one is going to do education, if we don't want to leave a child behind, if we want to test them to see if they are meeting the skills, give the schools the resources to adequately do it and not short change them. Unfortunately, that is what has happened in the last few years. In the last fiscal year we are short \$8 billion nationwide to fund education.

I do not disagree with what the President says but let us fully fund the education. So I really think that the President put forth some ideas. I think they fall short in some areas. We are willing to work with him, the Republican party, the majority party in this

House, but they have to include us in some of these programs.

Democrats do have a better way. We do want to see a number of things happen. We want to see, like, homeland security. We talked a little bit about that. But let us fully fund our first response people. Let us improve our domestic nuclear security and protect our communities against a terrorist attack. We can do this by doing inspection of cargo. It is something so simple that we could do, the technology is there. We even know the cost.

We have sat on the Committee on Energy and Commerce and we have laid out the cost and how much every one of these machines are, how many port of entries we have. We have close to 400 in this country where cargo comes in through ships from other countries. We know where. We know what the cargo is. Let us detect and make sure there is nothing coming in here. I think that is of even greater importance now as we have increased activity around this world in terrorism. And it is something we should be able to do. There is no reason why we cannot.

There are so many other things we could do. Like I said, I was really surprised that the President did not even mention them in the State of the Union address. Democrats we believe that we should ensure full payment of both retirement and a disability compensation to a half a million disabled American veteran retirees. We should do that immediately. Right now the way the law is if one has a military disability pension and a retirement from them, they deduct dollar for dollar if one is receiving disability from their retirement pay. They have earned both of them. They should be fully funded. Why could not we do that for them?

We should fully fund the veterans health care. We should permit an increase in bonuses for soldiers in combat. This is interesting. We had the motion on the Floor here during our debate on the \$87 billion for Iraq to provide a \$1,500 bonus for every man and woman who fought in Iraq or Afghanistan. \$1,500 out of \$87 billion. That tied 213-213 and the amendment did not pass. I could not believe it.

And here we are talking about the great job our men and women in the armed services are doing for us. And they do. But give them a little bonus. Most, and I should say a large number of people in Iraq are from the Reserves and the National Guard, they left their good paying civilian jobs when their country called upon them to go fight in Iraq. So we want to give them a \$1,500 bonus to help ease that financial concern at home. And it ended up in a tie in the U.S. House of Representatives. I cannot believe it. That was basically a party line vote. The President and the administration and Republican party will not support us so it ended up in a tie.

There are so many more things we could do. Democrats do have bold new ideas. We would like to be part of the

process. We urge the majority party and the President to work with us. We have a new year here, a new session just starting. We look forward to working with them. But as I said earlier, when we have these conferences and these ideas coming through Congress, all we ask is for an opportunity to have our amendments put forth before this floor, put together a substitute that we would be allowed to vote on. But, unfortunately, as we have seen on these major issues like Medicare, energy bill, the appropriations bills, we are just completely excluded.

That is almost unheard of in a country of this stature which is a true democracy that the minority party, in this case Democrats, representing 49 percent of the country, are not even allowed to put forth the proposals or amendments on the House floor. I know that upsets a lot of people and certainly upsets all of us.

Even if we do not have the votes to pass it, at least let our new ideas come forth on this Floor and be argued and debated and let the American people make up their mind on this legislation.

So I pleased to come down here and join my colleague. I look forward to doing that throughout the year as we have in the past working on this. There are other issues, and I look forward to working with him on them.

We have an opportunity, and I hope the President and his party will work with us, so we can move this country forward because the economy is not where we want it to be. We are struggling. As I said, Michigan alone lost the most manufacturing jobs of any State. We are hurting back in Michigan. We need some help.

There are some things we can do, but another tax cut is not going to jumpstart our economy in Michigan. It may be good for Wall Street, but it is not very good for Main Street where we do create the jobs. We have heard it so many times in the media that this is a jobless recovery. Well, the economy seems to be looking good on Wall Street. And IRAs and even 401(k)s and other things may look a little better, but for folks back home they are not employed, they are not working, it is not helping them.

In Michigan, at the last tax cut we got less than \$100. 46 percent of the people in Michigan got less than a \$100 in the last Bush tax cut. It is not going to help us out. Let us put some people back to work immediately. Adopt the Democratic plan which says we can put a million people back to work immediately by working in infrastructure, roads, bridges, port security, airport security, without adding to the deficit. We can do it by taking money out of the trust funds.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan not only because of what he said today, but also because of all the work he does, particularly on the committee that we are both on, the Committee on Energy and Commerce. But I was lis-

tening to what he said. He was talking about mostly in the context of his State, Michigan. But everything that he said applies to my State as well, and probably to the rest of the country.

One of the things he mentioned that I wanted to comment on was this whole effort to exclude the Democrats. He mentioned that, for example, with the Medicare prescription drug bill we were not invited to the conference to discuss the bill. Even the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the senior Member of the House, the ranking member on our committee, was excluded.

And when I talk to my constituents, and obviously my colleagues have the same reaction, they are shocked to find out that they elect somebody to come down here and just because they are of a particular party, that is, in the majority, that they have so little say. And we witnessed it earlier.

At the end of the day, when we have the little colloquy between the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and usually it is the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on our side about the schedule, today a couple of our Democratic colleagues brought up the fact that the Republicans have refused to even consider a debate on the issue of extending unemployment compensation. And the Republican Majority Leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) made it quite clear that he was opposed to extending unemployment compensation. But it was not enough that he said that he was opposed to it, he had to go further and say that he was not going to allow a debate on it.

And the reason he said, sort of in a sarcastic way, he said something about the fact, "Well, I think the Democrats said we have 208 members on a discharge petition to bring this bill up." And the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, "Well, last I heard, 218 is the majority." So what he essentially was saying well there may be 208 Democrats out there that are signed on and want to debate this issue, but since they are in the minority, even only by 10 votes, we are not debating it. That is the kind of thing we get.

I do not want to disparage him, but this is what we get all the time. The Democrats are not in the majority so there will be no debate. The Democrats are not in the majority so they will not be a party to the conference. The Democrats are not in the majority, so we are not really interested in their point of view.

Particularly last night, listening to the President's State of the Union Address, I noticed that many of the commentators said it was a very divisive speech, that there was no effort to reach out and say maybe we do not agree on this issue whether it is health care or job creation or whatever, but even though we do not agree, let us get together and try to work it out in a unified way.

□ 1430

Never was that suggested. It was almost as if this was my way or the highway. It is a very bad development in the way that we operate around here, and I think it is important that the gentleman mention it. I appreciate that the gentleman mentioned it.

The other thing I wanted to say just in terms of comparing what the gentleman said about Michigan versus New Jersey, so many soft things you mentioned are true for my State as well. I thought it was very glaring that there was absolutely no mention in the President's speech about any environmental concerns, as if the environment did not even exist as an issue. In the past he has always tried to touch upon it a little. Even though he has a terrible record, in my opinion, and has been cutting back on environmental regulation and enforcement, he would at least mention it. It was not even mentioned.

As the gentleman said, my State of New Jersey has more Superfund sites than any other State, and my congressional district has the most Superfund sites in the State of New Jersey. And it is very upsetting to my municipalities because many of these Superfund sites that are terribly toxic, we have one in Edison, New Jersey, that was the site where they produced agent orange, the herbicide, during the Vietnam War. It is in the stage now where they are gradually cleaning it up. But because they are told there is no money left in the Superfund, that may have to stop, actually has stopped on occasion, and then started up again when the money was available.

That is what we are facing, the crisis with the hazardous waste clean-ups because there is no money left from the Superfund because the President did not want to renew the tax on the oil and chemical industry that would pay for the clean-up.

The gentleman talked about the ports. Obviously, one way that is very effective in terms of creating jobs is to spend money on infrastructure, on homeland security. New Jersey, like Michigan, is a State that has a lot of port activity. Most of the cargo that comes into the port of New York actually comes into New Jersey, the majority of it. I have heard from so many of the inspectors about how so little of the cargo is inspected.

We had a situation in December while we were not here in Congress where our governor had to announce that he could not, there was a proposal because of the bad state of the roads in New Jersey to increase the gasoline tax, and he decided not to do it because he knew that a tax increase would probably not pass and there would be a lot of political opposition to it, so he decided not to increase the gas tax. But we face a crisis in our transportation infrastructure.

If we can get an infusion of funds from the Federal Government to help with our bridges and our highways, not

only would we be able to fix them up and make transportation easier; but it would create a lot of jobs, and we do not get this. All we get is more tax cuts and there is no way that, either in the short or the long run, that that is going to be job creation.

The thing that really surprised me, and I do not know where the gentleman stands on this issue, last night the only thing that I thought the President mentioned about job creation was the need for more free-trade agreements. He signed all these free-trade agreements over the last couple of years, and that is a major reason why so many of the jobs have gone south, not only to Mexico but to China and other countries.

Here he is again saying, okay, we need more of these free-trade agreements. Free trade is all right, but we have got to have some kind of a program to enhance our manufacturing base before we just sign all these agreements and let everybody take away all our manufacturing jobs. It is just amazing to me.

We could keep going on, and I do not want to necessarily keep repeating what the gentleman said, but I just want to say that so many of the things that the gentleman mentioned have direct application to my State, and all we keep getting is more tax cuts for the wealthy, more debt. And somehow the suggestion on the part of the President is that that is helping with the economy, when I think it is doing the opposite.

I do not know if the gentleman wanted to add anything else.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman spoke a little bit about the trade agreements. Now they are trying to push the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas. In the past year we have done the Chilean Trade Agreement, Singapore. We have done a number of them, but yet we still see jobs leaving this country.

When we talk about it, everybody says, well, we will enforce the laws that are on the books, but look at what just happened with steel. The International Trade Commission found unanimously, six-nothing, that there was illegal dumping of steel goods in this country. By illegal dumping I mean they are selling it in this country at less than what it cost to produce it in China or Brazil or the Ukraine or wherever it was, and they dumped it here. And the President said, all right, since you have harmed our industry, we will help our steel industry and the iron ore miners that I represent in Northern Michigan. We will put a tariff on it.

That lasted 18 months and the President pulled out of the agreement. Now we no longer have these tariffs again, and you will see steel starting to get dumped once again in this country.

So when the President says, I need more trade agreements to open up the global market and we will enforce the laws, the first one we have seen where

he has actually taken a high-profile case, the steel industry, he is going to hold it for 3 years, 3 years at 30 percent. Three years those tariffs would be on. It would be a 30 percent tariff.

And then what happened half way through it because of pressure from some of our trading partners, the President decides to abandon the tariffs. He promised the steel industry 3 years to get back on its feet. There has been consolidation. There has been more efficiency in the steel industry. Our mines, and I had a couple mines up there, they have consolidated to cut costs to be more competitive. We make the best steel in the world. And we have all worked together.

He said 3 years. We have laid out a 3-year plan to revitalize the steel industry in this country. That lasted 18 months. So when the President says that, with all due respect, he sort of loses a little credibility in my mind when he wants to bring out further trade agreements, not just a Free Trade Agreement with the America which would be all the way down to South America; but he is also talking about a Middle East trade agreement which would include the Middle East, including Iraq. We have had a trade agreement this last year with Jordan.

There are trade agreements all the time. And no matter where you fall on it, you decide for or against them, but when you find clear-cut violations like in the steel industry where the International Trade Commission by a six-zero vote unanimously says, they have dumped illegal steel in this country and hurt our industry, we have a right now to bring in to remedy the situation. The President does it for 3 years, and he pulls out after 18 months.

So I have little faith that any future trade agreements, when there are violations, they will say, oh, we are getting pressure from our trade partners, therefore, too bad. I talked about Michigan. We lost the most manufacturing jobs of any State under this President. Those jobs are gone. Those were good-paying jobs. What do you replace them with? Service industry jobs, minimum wage, jobs with no benefits.

While we are losing these jobs and have record unemployment in Michigan, we are at 7 percent unemployment, what did they do on overtime in the budget bill that we passed here? The reason why many of us did not vote for it, they have a clause in there that you do not have to pay overtime anymore.

One of the hallmarks of employee rights in this, if you work more than 40 hours you get overtime. Under the President's proposal, they will overhaul the overtime rules that would cause in Michigan alone over 300,000 workers to lose access to their overtime pay.

The President says, it does not affect those who have a collective bargaining agreement. Guess what? As soon as that collective bargaining agreement expires, what is the employer going to

say? I do not have to pay overtime anymore. The Federal law has changed; you guys are out of luck.

That is what we cannot have. So, again, we are willing to work with this President. We are willing to work with the majority party. We even bang on their door when they do not invite us to the prescription drug or budget. We bang on the door. And besides sending the Capitol Police, I wish they would ask us to sit down and let us work together. At the end of the day, after we have our voice, after we are heard, whether it is on the House floor or in committee, if we do not have the votes on the proposal so be it. That is the democratic process. But at least give us access to this process. We do represent 49 percent of the people in this country; and, hopefully, after November it will be more than 49 percent.

We just want access, to have an opportunity to have a fair debate with the American people on these proposals, whether it is the President's health insurance proposal, his trade agreements, his environmental policies. We are happy to debate. But do not stick these proposals in these massive omnibus budget bills that no one reads and no one has time to look at, and we run it over to the Senate and rubber stamp it over there and we come back and the President signs it. Because there are many things in there that do affect the well-being of the American people in the gentleman's district and mine. We certainly have a right to be heard on each and every one of those issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree and I appreciate the gentleman coming down here.

I wanted to say one last thing. The manufacturing sector is very crucial in terms of job creation and job retention, for the gentleman's State, for my State, and all over.

The thing that is amazing about it is when I listened to the President last night, when we look at other countries, whether it is Canada or Western Europe or certainly true for China and the Asian countries, they have a national policy that basically dictates trying to create jobs.

If there is going to be a free-trade agreement with Singapore, for example, I am sure that Singapore has figured out how they are going to gain and benefit. If they are going to lose jobs, they will retrain people to create more jobs in another sector.

If you listened to the President last night, it is almost like, that is not my job, that is not my responsibility. He talked about job training, but he did not suggest how job training would be worked in such a way to train for a new job.

We talked about the manufacturing sector. In New Jersey, in my district, we consider ourselves sort of like a little Silicon Valley, the IT sector; health care is a big sector. And even those jobs are now being lost overseas. We have radiologists complaining about

how the radiology is being done in Asia, or the IT sector where the computer jobs are going overseas.

So we have to have some kind of national policy with regard to job retention and job creation. And he does not even mention that. That is not our job. Washington, the President, the Congress have nothing to do with that. So when he talks about job training, I am like, well, what are you training for? You do not give us any details on how somebody is going to be trained to go work for a job that is available. It is very disconcerting.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned throughout this Special Order today, Michigan has lost so many manufacturing jobs, more than any other State. We actually got together, the congressional delegation, and the Democrats in particular, along with our governor, Governor Granholm, and actually put together a proposal, a HELP proposal as we called it: Health insurance, employment benefits, liabilities of the pension fund so they have a pension when they retire, and then a U.S. dollar policy. We laid out a very thoughtful document and sent it up to the White House and the President and asked them to at least comment on it and join with us because no economy in this world can exist without at least a strong manufacturing base; and we are losing it so quickly in this country, especially the last few years.

So we put forth our proposal called HELP. Unfortunately, we have not heard anything back from the White House. I know they have been on break. Now we have the budget wrapped up, so maybe we will take a look at it. But there are, Governor Granholm, some of us in the House and at least on the Michigan Democratic congressional delegation, trying to do something because we feel strongly that if you do not have a strong manufacturing base, service industry is fine, high-tech, all that is fine, but you still need a basic manufacturing base to your country. So we put forth a proposal. Again, we are willing to work with the President on that because we do have to keep good-paying manufacturing jobs here in this country. They cannot all go south, and we have to do some things to help out pensions, health care, employment benefits and the value of the dollar as a big impact on our goods overseas.

So we hope that we can work with this administration and this President in addressing those concerns we have on manufacturing.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree. I just want to reiterate in closing what the gentleman said again about the need to work with Democrats. Really, the hallmark of this administration, and also the Republican leadership in this House, has been to exclude the Democrats and not have us be part of the debate. That has got to change because otherwise I think we will never get to a situation where we can have consensus proposals for job creation,

for health care, on the environment that are really going to be meaningful. I think that Congress suffers from the fact that this bipartisanship has essentially disappeared under the Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again.

AMERICA'S DRUG POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of this Special Order, and I hope to be joined by several of my colleagues, is going to be narcotics policy in the United States and a number of success stories we have had.

We often talk about the problems and challenges as chairman of the Subcommittee on Drug Policy, the committee that has oversight over all drug issues but also authorizing over the Office of National Drug Control Policy, so-called Drug Czar, Director John Walters. We have authorizing and oversight on all drug issues.

Before I get directly into the subject of this Special Order, I wanted to say a few words about last night's wonderful address on this floor and to this assembly.

If the President had included every single thing of importance and everything we have in our budget, we would still be sitting here this morning. So I first want to thank the President for finishing his speech in 60 minutes.

My colleagues were sharing many concerns that I share as well. That is why our budgets are this thick. That is why we debate all year long on appropriations. But the goal of the State of the Union address is to set a basic vision for where our country is headed; and I thought President Bush did a remarkable job of outlining the major challenges that we face.

□ 1445

We are not a county or a city council. We are not mayors. We are not governors. First and foremost, this body and the President of the United States and the United States Senate have to do international policy. States and local governments cannot do things like the challenges we faced after 9/11 in trying to root out terrorism in Afghanistan, root out terrorism in the funding and the harboring of terrorists in Iraq, to try to break up these networks worldwide, and the President definitely had his focus on the one thing that only the President can lead in and that was our national security. He said, very eloquently, after the first World Trade Center attack and the bombing occurred there, the people were served with subpoenas, they went through our court process, but then the terrorist groups came back and hit us even bigger. We cannot just issue subpoenas. We have to tackle the problem head-on.

He also said in response to some critics that we are not going to get a permission slip to protect the American people. We each took an oath of office to uphold the security of the American people, every Member of this body and the President of the United States, and in spite of all the criticism, it would have been easier to make some compromises last night on some of this stuff but he held firm because he would prefer to win, but if it is necessary to protect American security, he will do what is necessary, and if the people do not understand it and reject him, he can look at himself in the mirror and said I did my best job, I did my best job to defend the American people, I upheld the Constitution to do that. He showed his boldness last night in defending his policies.

By the way, both sides stood up and cheered. On these issues, there was not a my-way-or-the-highway approach. I saw both sides of the aisle standing on almost all of his statements on international security, on Iraq, on Afghanistan. I saw bipartisanship. Not every Member of the other party stood, but most did and most supported, at least many of them, the war resolution itself.

Let me mention a couple of other specifics. For example, I support veterans assistance, too. In my district, I do not have any active bases. I have lots of guard and reserve units, and I voted for and support the continued effort if we are going to use guard and reserve like the military to try to address pay concerns, and we are not going to have an active voluntary military unless we improve pay and health service and all sorts of things for the veterans.

I am on the Select Committee on Homeland Security. I strongly believe we have to do more on the domestic side of homeland security, but fortunately, by disrupting, as the President pointed out, by disrupting the terrorist bases, by disrupting the financial assistance that they have, the places to hide out, they are continuing to try to penetrate us the same ways because they do not have the training grounds in Iraq. They do not have the training grounds in Afghanistan. They do not have the financial networks. They do not have places to hide out right now so we have been able to intercept them, which buys us time to help along the Canadian border, along the Mexican border, to try to get better and faster equipment in our harbors because the cost would be horrendous to try to defend every child care center in America, to try to defend every single harbor, to slow us down so that our goods in the United States go up way in prices as we try to ship them in and out, as we try to check 100 percent at the border. It just cannot work right now.

As we move these machines in, for example, many of these machines at the airport cost \$1.5 million each. One cannot walk down to Wal-Mart and

pick them up. It takes a while for the companies to make them, to implement them at the airports, but because we have disrupted those bases, because they do not have places to hide out, we have not been hit on our soil. Because of the brave men and women in our Armed Forces, they are taking the bullets that were intended for us here.

So we have time to develop our domestic homeland security because of the initiatives the President has done. And the fact is, I know those who would like to throw the incumbent party out of office do not like to admit this, but the economy is recovering, and the economy is recovering in spite of 9/11. In spite of the weakness that occurred after 9/11 in the markets exposing the fraud and cheating of companies like Enron and others who are manipulating the markets, in spite of the uncertainties of war, the economy is coming back, and it is coming back more efficient, and the jobs are increasing not at a fast enough rate.

Underneath that we have some problems. That is why we have the job retraining because we are having reshifting. I hope we address the Chinese currency question and the unfair trade policies of China that are ripping the guts out of my District just like they are in other places and unnecessarily causing adjustments. The President pointed out we needed an energy bill and we need new health care bills because when we talk about jobs, when we talk to industry and the people who create the jobs and the investors, they want the tax cuts. If the Democrats succeed in raising the taxes, they will kill the recovery because when they say they do not like the President's tax cuts, what they mean is they do not want to vote to extend them, and if we do not extend them, as the President said last night, it is an increase.

So, if they increase the taxes, does anybody really believe there will be additional investment to keep our economy recovering? Do people really believe if we increase the taxes on inheritances that small businesses will not disband and continue to sell out to foreign corporations because of inheritance taxes? Do people really believe if we raise capital gains taxes again that people will expand their companies and add jobs in their companies? Do people really believe that if we increase their income taxes, and as the President said last night, everybody who pays taxes got a tax cut. The only people who did not get a tax cut are the people who do not pay income taxes. They did not get an income tax cut because they do not pay income, but if you pay income, you got a tax cut, and by giving more dollars to people, people were able to invest and now help lead the stock market recovery.

After 9/11 if we had not given the \$600 to individuals, I just cannot imagine where our economy would be, and then the child tax credit, can my colleagues imagine the pressures on families trying to deal with health care and hous-

ing costs and clothing costs if all of the sudden the Democrats succeed in taking back the tax credits? We will have a disaster in the economy. That is why the President talked about taxes last night and health care last night and some adjustments; and he talked about Medicare, too, which is important with seniors.

The only area where we did not really have bipartisan support was when the President addressed social issue. When he talked about abstinence education, it was really disappointing to see that become a partisan issue. Since when has abstinence before marriage become a partisan issue? That was really sad. Since when did the Defense of Marriage Act, which even President Clinton signed, that said marriage should be between a man and a woman forever, when did that become a partisan issue? When did drug testing and drug prevention programs become partisan?

I am concerned about the divides on the social issue area because, in fact, we had the bipartisan support for the Medicare bill. It could not have passed if we had not had literally dozens of Democrats for that bill. The tax bill would not have passed without Democratic support. We would not have been able to pass the war resolution without Democratic support, but on things like faith-based, on abstinence education, defending marriage in the United States, we do need to have bipartisan support. We need help from the other side. We cannot just have those issues be Republican issues, and it was really disturbing last night to see that division, and when it is viewed as the President interjecting partisanship, if he raises the subject of abstinence education, my lands, how is that partisan? If we say I believe marriage should be between a man and a woman that is partisan?

Those people who criticize faith-based organizations as being partisan have a problem right now. Where has the consensus and the moral foundations of America gone? I thought the President laid that kind of comprehensive vision, not the particulars that will come in the budget, but the comprehensive vision of a strong America that stands up against evil in the world, wherever it is coming from, an America that is founded on letting people keep their own money, of trying to create job creation, not have Washington drive everything, not having lawsuits drive our economy but having the people that are investing in it drive the economy, and a moral, Judeo-Christian-based foundation in America that treats people decently and accommodates all kinds of religious diversity as people move into our country but understands that faith plays a key role in our Nation. That was the vision he laid out.

Now it is our job as Congress to take his budget that he proposes to us and get into the specifics of how we fund the National Guard and what we do in

the national parks. I have worked with my colleague from New Jersey on fish and wildlife issues, on human rights issues. We do that stuff on a regular basis, but last night we had an amazing presentation on the basic vision of where we are going in America, and I was excited by that speech.

One of the things the President also addressed was a few new anti-narcotics initiatives, but I think a lot of people missed something he said right at the beginning of his new initiatives on drug testing and prevention and trying to correct steroid abuse in the United States, and that is, that we have had a drop in illicit drug usage in the United States of 11 percent in the last 2 years. It is an extraordinary thing.

I get a lot of flak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. The drug legalizers groups, and groups funded by George Soros that masquerade as large citizen groups but get their money mostly from George Soros and his few allies who are billionaires to try to legalize drugs in the United States, hiding behind so-called medicinal marijuana which is not medicinal at all, and heroin needles, distribution, free heroin clinics and all this type of stuff, really predominantly a drug legalization movement funded by George Soros and his allies. Those groups do not like me. They do not like anything that comes out of our committee, and they are constantly harassing us.

They opposed and were just really crushed when the ONDCP, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the National Ad Campaign passed this House by voice vote. They were just crushed because they had this idea that there was going to be this big uprising and drug policy would be defeated, but the fact is we have done drug policy in a bipartisan way. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is the ranking member of the subcommittee, he and I do our best to work together on all issues, to draft the bill together. He had multiple amendments. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and I often do not see eye to eye on other things, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the chairman of the full Committee on Government Reform, and I do see eye to eye, and we have our differences at times with the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), but we realized on drug policy we needed to stand together and worked to address the evils. By doing that, we have had a reduction.

Often, I will come to the House floor and talk about the problems of Oxycontin and the rise in meth and the struggles in Colombia and Mexico and Canada and in Afghanistan, but the truth is if all we hear is the struggles, we miss the part of the success story, that in fact, the money we have been spending, by raising the struggles, by raising the problems, the money we have been spending has actually been working.

Those who are libertarians, or I would call liberal-tarians, whether they be far right or far left anti-government people, want a line and say government programs never work. No government programs can tinker at the edges. Job creation predominantly comes from the private sector, but incentives can help, that in education it should be mostly at the local government but had we not addressed through IDEA and certain civil rights legislation many people in American would not have had a chance, and the Federal Government needed to directly step in. Clearly in housing, had the Federal Government not stepped in in certain areas, there would not be some of that social safety net. That is not the primary. From a concerted perspective, I think it is secondary, but in some groups, it was very primary and important.

Same thing in narcotics policy. We have most law enforcement is State and local. Most treatment is State and local or private sector through insurance. Most of these things are done through the private sector, but the government plays a critical role, and let me read a few of the accomplishments this year through the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

One of the most visible is the national campaign against marijuana which is probably why there has been such an outcry and an angry frustration with some of our policies, because the one thing they do not want to happen was marijuana. So let me address that a minute.

We hear, and as I started to point out, about all the negatives and then we start to think it is not working, but in fact, we have made progress. We have these peaks that drug use in the United States went up in the 1960s, dropped, went up again, dropped under Reagan, went up again. By the way, we would have to reduce drug use in the United States 50 percent to get it back to where it was when President Clinton took office. We can argue with subgroups in that and some went up higher than others and some drugs went up higher than others, but we are making progress now partly because, quite frankly, we had a balloon when our national policy from 1992 to 1994, our national policy was hear no evil, see no evil, do no evil.

From that perspective, what happened was is the President started joking about I did not inhale. They cut the drug czar's office from 120 people down to 23 people. They cut the interdiction money going to South America by dramatic amounts, and guess what, cocaine and heroin flooded into our country. Marijuana flooded our streets. The stigma went off like it did in the 1960s. The grades of marijuana went up in their potency from 5 to 8 percent THC to 15 to 25, in some places, 40 percent THC, where marijuana is as potent and as dangerous as cocaine and sells for that amount in the streets. Those changes in 1992 and 1994 were dramatic.

President Clinton, to his credit, after the Republicans took over and after a little bit of arm twisting, brought in General McCaffrey to head the drug czar's office, gave him dollars, and since 1995 we have had pretty steady progress for 8 years. The first couple of years were more to flatten out the trends, then to get like a 2 percent, and last year, there was an 8 percent reduction in marijuana. People who say the national ad campaign does not work are wrong. The fact is, by educating people, not just hammering off over the heads and saying, look, you are going to wind up forever destroyed if you use marijuana, no, not everybody who does winds up destroyed, but you cannot get at cocaine, heroin, meth, oxycontin and other abuses as a whole unless you get at marijuana, because marijuana and alcohol abuse, but for the other hard drugs, marijuana basically is an entry level drug.

□ 1500

For every 10 marijuana users, one, or maybe two, counting high-grade marijuana, will move into a harder drug. If you have 100, you will have 10 over here. If you have a thousand, you will have a hundred over here. If you have 10,000, you will have a thousand over here. The percents stay roughly the same.

Because once you are introduced, a certain percentage will become addicted, whether psychological or physical. A certain percentage will want a higher hit, a bigger and longer impact of the narcotics. And the next thing you know, you have more addicts.

So to make a really dramatic reduction, Director Walters decided to go at marijuana. So the national ad campaign showed all kinds and they studied particularly target youth groups. I hear a lot of people say, I do not see a lot of those ads, or I do not particularly like those ads. Well, guess what, 53-year-old white guys like me are not the primary target. Not saying there are not 53-year-old white guys who are abusing cocaine, but we are not the prime target. We are trying to get people at the entry, at the gateway coming in and getting addicted. By the time you are 53, if you are addicted, you need a treatment program. And we are working with the treatment programs and trying to do that. What we need to do is get at the people as they are coming into the system.

I see I have been joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), and he has been a leader in the drug-testing area. If I can, let me make a brief introduction on the drug testing.

Last night, the President proposed an initiative for \$25 million for drug testing. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been looking at this issue for some time. I worked on this when I was a staffer over on the Senate side with Senator Coates years ago. So let us say this as point blank as we can. Drug-free prevention programs and treatment programs will not work without

drug testing. You have to have an accountability. The President last night said that as part of our prevention treatment programs we are going to put in some measurement sticks, just like he talked about in education and just like he talked about in other areas, and one of those things is drug testing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my friend from Pennsylvania to talk about a little of that and whatever other issue he wants to talk about.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who is the leader in Congress on this issue. I want to commend him for these efforts because these are not issues that are pushed by the power brokers in this country or pushed by the big PAC givers. These are the issues that are at the heart and soul of America's kids and who, I feel, have more peer pressure today to deal with the drug issue than any generation before them.

This used to be a city issue. For years, maybe decades, the cities have been infected with drugs. But I hear the experts today say there is not a community in America that does not have a drug problem. Now, one of the problems we have is a lot of those communities do not realize the severity of the problem and sometimes kind of just want to look by it as long as it has not impacted them or their families or their neighborhoods.

I represent a huge rural district in Pennsylvania, one of the largest rural districts in the eastern part of the country, and I have hundreds and hundreds of small towns. I have not talked to a youngster in my office that does not tell of the severity of the drug issue in their school and the easy availability, marijuana being available in middle school. Sometimes kids will actually smoke a marijuana cigarette before they smoke tobacco because it is easier to buy. They do not have to have an ID card. Stop and think about that.

Jonathan Walters, the Drug Czar, was with me in my district about a year ago and is doing a wonderful job. I will never forget the face of a young lady, 16 years old, who lived in a small town of about 6,000 people. This is an area you would think would not be infested with drugs. When she was 14 she was using three bags of heroin a day. The young people in that school were driving into north Philadelphia and they were buying pure uncut heroin.

The tragedy of that is that usually heroin is the drug for the end-of-the-line user. When people got hooked on heroin, they had worked their way all the way up the food chain. Heroin is such a powerfully addicting drug, it is usually just a matter of time until their life is over. But here we have 14-year-old and 15-year-old and 16-year-old teenagers who are into heroin. I have probably 10 or 15 communities in my district that have known heavy heroin use in kids.

The power of it is that it is uncut pure heroin that is affordable and

available. And the problem with that is it is so addictive that the drug counselors tell me if you have any kind of an addictive personality you may never lick the habit. Now, this young lady, I said to her, what is your wish? Well, she said, my wish in life is that I had never touched it. I am on my second rehabilitation program, and I hope I can stay drug-free. I do not want to ever do drugs again.

But the addiction is so powerful, and when you take young people like that, who are not even mature as an adult yet, and give them uncut heroin, or uncut cocaine, or the one that has been terribly impacting my region also, which is methamphetamine, where it is manufactured in laboratories out in the country, in homes and garages and barns and buildings, it is about as addicting as heroin and about as powerful. And I am told many times people who may be first- and second-time users will fight that addiction the rest of their life.

So those who think testing is an intrusion of privacy, I want to plead with you that testing is the only way parents know, it is the only way a family knows, it is the only way schools know what your child is doing. And if you have it to where schools participate voluntarily and parents approve of their kids being tested, I would test all kids that parents would allow the test. Leave it a freedom of choice of the family, but I would make it a negative check-off where everybody gets tested.

Now, that is not where most are at today. But I listened to the debate at the Supreme Court when they expanded from sports activities to all extracurricular activities, and some schools have gotten creative and said kids driving their cars to school, because assuming you drive your car to school, you are more likely to be bringing drugs in here.

I had an argument with a nationally well-known figure, and if I mentioned his name you would all know him, but he was arguing on a national television show against testing, so I said to him, well, if my memory is correct, 15 or 20 years ago the military had a rampant drug problem, and random testing fixed it. He stopped, he paused, he said, yes, I was there. I was a part of that. I had never related it, but you are right. I change my position at this moment. I would support random drug testing.

So today I introduce the Empowering Parents and Teachers for a Drug Free Education Act. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) joined me and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE). That is a band of three. But I think it is legislation whose time has come.

I cannot tell you how excited I was last night when the President put sufficient emphasis on this. It is not about privacy. It is about helping young people who are now being exposed to drugs that are so powerful that if they use them once or twice they may be addicted the rest of their lives. So it is preserving their life.

It is not about drug enforcement. It is about when you find a youngster that has drugs in their system that the parents get involved, and then the schools get involved to first help them with this problem. A youngster into drugs without help will soon be too far down the road that they will literally owe their life to the drug dealers.

When you look at who the drug dealers are, we know today for a fact that terrorism is often funded by drug dealers. The drug dealers of America in our small towns are the scourge of this country. They are the low life who care nothing about the future of our youth, care nothing about the future of this country. They are just interested in the mammoth profits they make selling this poison to our young people.

I will never forget the discussion I had last year with my granddaughter Nicole. We were going shopping after Christmas, returning some things and spending some of her money she had gotten for Christmas, and we always get on this subject. And she said, Pop, why are you so concerned I will get on drugs? I am a good student. I am doing well in school, she said. I am not going to do drugs, Pop. So I said, well, who do you think will entice you to do drugs? She said, oh, some creep at school or somebody that will come. I said, no, Nicole, that is not who will introduce you to drugs. The person who will introduce you to drugs is one of your best friends, like Jacquelyn, whose boyfriend or friend has, maybe at a party where she has had a couple of beers, even though that is not legal, but her judgment is impaired and she tries them. When she tries them and has gotten into that habit, she is going to want her best friend, Nicole, to be with her.

It is not some creep that introduces our kids to drugs. It is somebody who is their friend. It is somebody who they have an established relationship with. I guess the thing that scares me, and that I wish school superintendents would be more scared of, and I wish parents would be more fearful of is that their child, without any doubt is going to have numerous opportunities to do drugs. Even if they are not an avid drinker, even if they are not into the other things where they are more likely to, there will be a time. So we must help these young people.

In the workplace today it is common practice. You sign a form, and in most cases they say we will be randomly drug testing. That is the way of the work world. In the military, you will be randomly drug tested. And I find there is no tool to help get drugs out of our schools. If I were president of a college, I would have on the application form that you will be randomly drug tested. And I would promise the parents that brought them there that my first goal would be to run a drug-free college. It would be difficult, but it would be my number one goal. Because those are still those formative years.

The kids tell me that the age at which they are asked to do drugs is

getting younger and younger and younger. And when you get down to 8th and 9th graders, who are not that mature yet, who are more vulnerable, and the drugs are more available to them, and they are more potent than they have ever been, a lot of them are pure and uncut, and at that those young ages, if they try once, they may never lick the habit.

I thank my colleague for the chance to join him.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my fellow colleagues today in applauding our President last night for his position on drug testing, and I would certainly agree with what my colleagues have just said, because young people today are faced with this onslaught.

First of all, we have a media around them, entertainment media, et cetera, that actually breaks down their ability to make the right decisions for their lives in the long run, and drug testing would not only go a long way in terms of just identifying a young person whose parents need to know that they are vulnerable and are perhaps making some wrong choices in their life, but drug testing also gives these young people an added incentive to say no.

Without drug testing, if you are talking about your daughter going to a party or something and having a few beers, there is nothing she can say to the person proposing using drugs except, well, that is wrong and we should not do that; my parents have told me that is wrong. And that is about as neat a thing to say at a party as I guess let us listen to Bing Crosby music or something like that. But if there is drug testing in school, young people will know what to say. And what to say is I cannot take this drug because I may be tested for drugs in my school tomorrow. And if I get tested for drugs and I am positive, my parents will know about it.

And as far as I am concerned, any young person who is found to have drugs through drug testing, and there should be drug testing in our schools from junior high all the way through, not only should their parents be notified but the student should be able to then face an extra hurdle to jump over before graduation. And that hurdle should be a class that they need to take that will demonstrate to them the evils and the threat that drugs have for them as an individual. We need to let this child, who is now a young person, sit through a few films and some personal stories about how drugs have destroyed the lives of other young people and make that mandatory if that young person tests positive for drugs.

□ 1515

They would have to get a passing grade. And I would suggest that if someone has tested positive for drugs

before they get their degree, they have got to test so they are not on drugs. In other words, we have got to provide positive incentives for young people not to get involved in this type of behavior in the first place. Again, I would applaud our President for taking a positive approach. I have some disagreement with some of my other colleagues as to how effective the war on drugs is and how effective just focusing on enforcement or interdiction is. I do not think they have been effective at all. That is why we have got to try this personal approach, personal responsibility, focusing on identifying those people who are vulnerable, especially focusing and identifying people who might make us vulnerable. Airline pilots, doctors, people who our lives are in their hands, they all should be drug tested, but then especially testing young people to make sure their parents can know that there is a challenge and giving an incentive for these young people to say no when they are offered these drugs.

I would join you both in applauding our President and hope that we can stimulate people across this country to look at drug testing as a positive alternative rather than some sort of threat to privacy. The only way it would be a threat, I would say, to civil liberties is if drug testing is mandatory and then we believe that we are going to prosecute young people for using drugs. That would be self-incrimination in my point of view, but I do not think that is what is being advocated here. What is being advocated here is drug testing in order to facilitate some type of outreach program to get someone so they are not using drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to reiterate the gentleman's last point. This is a prevention and interdiction tool to help reach people before they become heavy addicts. That is why it is targeted at the schools. There is a body of law that has to be followed. This program will be thrown out in any school that does not follow the body of law. In 1989 and 1990 in the omnibus drug bill, my former boss in the Senate, the junior Senator from Indiana, whose name I guess I cannot say here on the floor, that we had an amendment based off of a high school in West Lafayette, Indiana where the baseball team had an outfielder who got hit on the head with a fly ball. And he was a very good fielder. The question was, how did he miss a fly ball?

A similar thing happened, I think, to the third baseman. In that process, they decided to drug-test their baseball team. They found that one-third were high. So they decided to put in a policy of drug testing on athletes and then cheerleaders. We took that as an allowable use then in the drug-free school bill, in the 1989-1990 bill, and put that in as an allowable use. It was then attempted to be expanded in Texas and a few other States student-wide. The court initially just upheld where there was extra risk in athletics and then as

our colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, it broadened it in a recent court case to go to the next step. But in the legislation it was very explicit.

We also did this in the drug-free workplace. We did it on truck drivers' testing. The test has to be either a total classification or purely random. They cannot say, "That guy has long hair. I think he's doing drugs. I'm going to test him. I'm not going to test this." In a company you need to test the management and the owners, not just the employees. You have to have equitable treatment, including us in Congress should be testing ourselves, even though technically we are exempt from this. If we are going to put it on government employees, we ought to be doing it ourselves in our offices.

The second thing is related to that, the type of tests and how you do the tests are by law required. If you are going to use a urine test, there are standards of how you keep that, how you sort it, how you mark it, that you have a second test so you do not get any false positive with it. Hair tests and follicle tests are much better and harder to mix up. There ought to be a logical appeals process with it. In other words, if you deprive people of their civil liberties in the process of this, even students in loco parentis, you got a problem. But the fact is, if you do it right, it is the best prevention and identification deterrent.

To share one of the stories from my district, I was at a school which was doing it in athletes. I like drug testing, like both of my colleagues, and proposed that it ought to be used more widely. The student body president objected and said this is a violation of my liberties. A couple of other people objected. And then one student got up and said that he had been abusing marijuana, got caught, his life had been going downhill, that that forced him to confront it just like the gentleman from California referred to and said he talked to his parents, got his life straightened around and he believed drug testing would be good.

Then somebody else from the student government objected again and a couple of the other students spoke up. And when we were done, the principal and superintendent came over and said, "We're implementing school-wide drug testing because every single person who spoke up against it has never had a drug violation or suspected but every one of the kids who spoke up for it had either had a problem or we wondered if they did." They were crying out for help, for accountability from adults in a society that does not care. That is another aspect of it. If they think they are going to go to jail, they are not going to speak up, but if they think somebody is going to reach out and love them and help them, I believe, and I believe our policies in the United States need to be focused not on legalizing the behavior, but we recognize that very few actually go to court for one-time marijuana use.

You cannot be our age and have gone through the 60s and the 70s without knowing lots of people who did marijuana, and I do not personally know anybody quite frankly who went to prison for just smoking marijuana. If they went to prison for that, they were probably involved either in multiple parties or dealing or driving somebody or something more extensive. As a practical matter, that is what we are trying to bust. My colleague from California and I have strong disagreements about Colombia policy and some other things, but on this type of thing in prevention and the treatment programs, quite frankly, these treatment programs that take all this money and do not want to measure whether their clientele are abusing when they come out, hey, that is a big problem. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. If the gentleman will yield, as I said, I believe that the interdiction effort and the efforts, punishment, et cetera, have not succeeded. One of the reasons that it has not succeeded in our society, what we have is laws on the books that supposedly make something illegal, yet we have, by our own actions not put a societal stamp of disapproval. In fact, by not having drug testing and by not having, as Ronald Reagan used to say, a Just Say No mandate, or a societal norm that is unaccepting of drug use as personal behavior, what we have done is we have got laws that are unenforced, so officially supposedly it is against the law, but at the same time, the norms of society are accepting drug use. I think that drug testing will make sure that young people know absolutely fully well that society has a stamp of disapproval on drug use. Right now it is very nebulous as to whether or not our society is against people using drugs or not. This would be a clear message to young people, saying that society is so much against it, we are even going to test you and if you are using drugs, we are going to send you through a special program to make sure that you know how harmful this can be, and so there is no question in these young people's minds.

The gentleman is right. Young people are looking out for guidance. Frankly I believe that if you threaten them, and I know we disagree on this, if you threaten them, sometimes it is almost titillating for kids to get around those type of rules where the sheriff comes up and we're going to put you in jail or something. But when you have to say you are not going to get your driver's license if we find out that you have been using drugs, you are not going to graduate, there is no getting around that. That is a real life stamp of disapproval. I think this would be very effective.

Again the gentleman is right on target for congratulating our President and applauding him for making this an emphasis in his State of the Union speech.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I have had young people and other peo-

ple who were opposed but most of the young people who come in my office support drug testing. They would like to see that down pressure on their friends who are struggling with the decision-making process.

Several years ago I was discussing this issue with a radio commentator on a big city talk radio program. He was making fun of me, according to the people who were listening to the station, prior to me coming on, that we are going to talk to the Congressman that wants our kids to fill a cup with urine and just was kind of making light of it. At the end of that discussion that day after I was off, one of my staff was listening, he said, you know, I was pretty opposed to this idea, but after the discussion, if I had a 12- or 14-year-old boy, and I don't, would I want testing or would I not and he had a long pause and he said, you know, I think the Congressman convinced me. Just the matter of having a discussion.

We have other tests. We have the hair test, which I think is one of the best because it reaches back. If you tested in September, you know the activity for months before, because the hair holds the drug. You have saliva tests, you have sweat tests, of course you have the blood tests, the urine tests. There is lots of testing today. One of the deterrents to schools doing it is the cost, especially in a small rural school district with there is not much extra cash to go around. That is what is so vital about the President's program saying, hey, if you decide, if the parents in your community talk to your administration and say we would like our kids tested and you develop a testing program, we're going to help. That is what this is about. This is not a mandate. I know in my district, I am going to be selling it. The young people want me to sell it. We need to encourage parents and community leaders to encourage school boards to move out and say, let's do everything we can do to make our school drug free. I have superintendents who are there. I have lots of superintendents who are afraid of the issue.

But I have had a couple of superintendents who have said they bring in dog teams, they bring in a drug enforcement officer, they bring in people who tell about the lives of people who got addicted to drugs and how their life was really over. Parents would have the right to veto if they did not want it. That keeps us out of the ACLU and the courts. In my view, I think there are a lot of things we can be doing, and what we are doing it for is the kids.

Joe Paterno is a strong proponent of drug testing. He has been coaching young men for a long, long time. On my very last time with him, as I went to leave the room, he said, Pete, you keep pushing that drug testing. I want to tell you, over my years of coaching, and I have been drug testing for some time, one year I let up and the next spring camp I saw some of my boys back from last year who I suspicioned

may have at times been on drugs, and I hadn't tested much that year and I saw more signs, because as a coach he knew, he could tell by watching their play in spring camp whether they had been using drugs or not. I do not know how he told.

He said, I want to tell you, I'll never make that mistake again. I continue to do more and more and more testing because testing works.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank both gentlemen for talking about drug testing. I want to put this a little bit in the context, because that was a critical part of the State of the Union last night to talk about that in particular, but once again as the President said at the front of that section, that, in fact, we have had a reduction in drug use in the United States. That is partly because we have a holistic policy that the drug testing is a key component of the accountability and the measurement.

As both of my colleagues have pointed out as well as myself, but particularly the gentleman from California, it is a stigma part that one of the things, I have been to Colombia now about 10 times and in multiple countries, particularly in the Andean region, where because of our demand, because we cannot control our demand, we are disrupting and overturning democracies that have been there for hundreds of years.

In Colombia, I think it was actually in Ecuador, in Guayaquil, a young student came up to me and said, why do you keep picking on the Andean nations? When I went to school in the United States, I saw no stigma at all. You could get dope in any college, you could get it from anybody. Why don't you put some stigma?

That is partly why I offered the amendment that is a very unpopular amendment but basically says if you get convicted of a drug crime and you are taking money from the taxpayers of the United States you're going to lose your loan. We have had arguments about how that has been interpreted and I do not agree with how it has been interpreted and we are trying to fix that but the bottom line is if you take somebody else's money, you should follow the laws of the United States. We cannot go to Colombia and say stop growing this stuff if we do not do things here like drug testing and that.

In Colombia, interestingly in this past year, we have had the most successful year yet, we are still struggling but we have had the most successful year yet in stabilizing at least large sections of that country. We have, in addition to having sprayed all but some concentrated areas of coca, which is why the attacks are getting so vicious, why we had some Americans shot down, why we have had our planes taking more hits than they ever have because we are not spraying the whole country anymore, we are spraying concentrated areas that are hard to get to and the drug dealers are digging in to fight to keep us from eradicating, but we have had the best spraying year.

One hundred fifty municipalities now have a government presence in them instead of just having the right-wing terrorists come through who originally were trying to protect the towns but were not government units and the left-wing FARC which provides protection for the drug growers fighting with each other, terrorizing the individual people. There is now a government presence since President Uribe took over in 150 municipalities that did not have it. They have had more than 300 projects and 25 departments benefiting displaced persons, rehabilitating child soldiers, providing legitimate employment opportunities. It is part of our Andean initiative to make sure that we do not just spray, we do not just eradicate but what are we doing for the people who are being disrupted because of our habits, our habits and western Europe.

□ 1530

Then the question is if we cannot get it there, we have got to get it in interdiction. Because of pulling a lot of our Coast Guard units in and some of the other things in around Homeland Security, we have had some gaps; but we have been doing reasonably well, particularly on the south border. For example, a couple of DEA busts along with the stigma on LSD, when we can tackle it, much like we are trying to do with meth and OxyContin hopefully too, this is the pattern of emergency room, when somebody comes in, do they mention that they were high on LSD? As we can see, it has dropped from 5,000 in 1999 to 891 in 2002.

In my home area in northeast Indiana, we had a similar drop. We had a jump up in LSD. We battle it hard; we interdict it. The DEA did a major undercover bust with it. We had publicity on attacking LSD, and when we put on the stigma combined with enforcement, it will drop.

Meth is a huge challenge, and it is a growing challenge. Even though all of us see the little labs, I want to make just a brief education point on meth because most Members here, if we ask them what is the fastest-growing category, everybody would say meth, but it is actually still only 8 percent of drug use, and 80 percent of the meth is coming from superlabs in California and Mexico even though we are seeing all these arrests in our district, because the labs we have in Indiana and rural Pennsylvania and others are dangerous and addictive and threatening the kids in those labs, but they are only cooking for themselves and maybe two other people, whereas the superlabs will ship it to thousands of people. California has been the leader in passing child abuse laws; and other States need to emulate that, that if they have a lab, because of the terrible deaths of kids getting exploded by their parents cooking and the dangers of the superlabs, but we need to focus on meth and crystal meth and ice and all the different variations like we had

on LSD to get this kind of trend and keep the law enforcement pressure on with the stigma pressure and with an education and prevention pressure.

One other thing. We are doing an OxyContin hearing in Orlando. They have had a series of deaths in that city because of overdoses on OxyContin. It is a difficult issue because they can have legitimate uses. Just like in meth, it is tough to regulate out of Brussels and out of Amsterdam and through Canada because ephedrine is not illegal. It has legal uses too. But the fact is we have to have the courage to stand up to some drug companies that do not want us to talk about the dangers of misuse of some legitimate drugs.

The President last night boldly addressed steroids. We heard, particularly those of us who are baseball fans, some questions being asked about records that were falling; and out of that process we learned more and more that in multiple sports that the success stories were because people were artificially pumping themselves up. As that pressure spread and as we listen to the stories of athletes in junior high and high school, the sad stories of these kids who are afraid they cannot get college scholarships, who are afraid they cannot be pro athletes, who are afraid they cannot advance unless they cheat, unless they alter their body, who are even more vulnerable than the baseball, football, basketball, wrestling, boxing stars who pump themselves up who have millions of dollars to get physician advice, who still destroy their bodies, now imagine being a young person who is still growing, who is filling out, who does not get the medical advice, and is putting their life at risk, not just damaging their body but putting their life at risk. And the President had the courage last night, like the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and others here in this body, to talk about the abuse in athletics and how we have to tackle that. Just like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and others have been leaders in trying to raise the issue of OxyContin here and the meth caucus in this Congress to try to address the meth questions, we have to work at the stigma.

One other thing in this general category. If we continue to succeed in the eradication, if we continue to succeed in the interdiction at the borders, if we continue to succeed in arresting the dealers and those who are working with that, if we can up our prevention efforts and if we can put through drug testing and an accountability provision in, we still have to worry about those who are addicted. And the President last night had a couple of references. One is, in drug treatment, he has an expansion of drug treatment. We have been increasing that rapidly here; and we need to continue to do that because, quite frankly, if we do not stop the number of people coming in, we cannot,

as Nancy Reagan so eloquently said, win a war just by treating the wounded. At the same time, we still have to treat the wounded. And if we can rehabilitate those who are addicted, we have a major impact on the drug problems in the United States. And the President proposed a faith-based initiative.

But he did one other thing. I support mandatory sentences for certain crimes because I do not like how the legal system is letting certain people off based on how rich they are or what color they are and getting to make up what sentences they have based on their legal representation. There ought to be the same accountability. If one is a dealer, this is what they get. If one is a multiple user, if one is driving somebody to a drug bust, this ought to be their penalty. Our crime reductions in the United States, in the streets of the United States, and 75 to 85 percent of all crime is drug and alcohol related, are because we locked more people up; but our prisons are jammed. Many of those people are now coming out of their sentences, and the question is what are we going to do? They are starting to re-enter our economy. They are going to be back, and if all they learned was to how to be a better criminal, if their kids, who now lost their mom or dad because they were in prison and did not get any help, instead of being able to pull themselves up out of their situation, are now destroyed, we are in deep trouble in society.

One of the other initiatives that the President announced last night was a major initiative to deal with housing kids of prisoners and initiatives in re-entry courts. There are a number of programs around the United States ranging from drug courts and looking for accountability of how to get drug courts that Director John Walters is trying to do and to get more patterns with it; but it is an innovative thing with an accountability, with the judge that people are working through. The drug testing is part of that, trying to include faith-based groups that put a religious and friend and volunteer accountability with it. But we also need to look at real problems of people not wanting to hire people when they are coming out of prison, people not yet wanting to let them in their apartment complex when they come out of prison.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who is on our subcommittee and is my colleague from Chicago from the other party, I am cosponsoring his legislation for trying to deal with the housing that often people who are coming out of prison face. The President understood that in addition to the Andean initiative, in addition to boosting the DEA, our critical anti-drug area, in addition to working with Homeland Security to make our borders secure from narco-terrorism and providing drug money to terrorists around the country that we have to do something to help rehabilitate those who have been in prison and we need to help them both

from a personal standpoint, as they deserve it as a human soul, and from a practical standpoint for the rest of us as they are coming out of prison. They have been locked up. Our crime rate has been down. Are we really prepared for the changes we are going to see if we have not invested in those people?

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I recently visited a prison in my district, a Federal prison; and 80 percent of those there were addicted to a drug. I believe the figure was 60 percent were there because they were selling drugs. That is a huge figure, \$35,000 per person to incarcerate people. We certainly can afford to invest in drug treatment and in prevention.

But I wanted to mention the issue of methamphetamine again. The gentleman talked about the big labs in California. I come from a very rural area. There is hardly a month that goes by that in our local community, a small town, the local paper talks of another meth bust, another lab found.

And I want to tell the Members the story of Suzie. Her name is not Suzie, but I want to protect the family. I remember vividly when Suzie moved to our area. She married a person locally who was very successful, a family. She was pleasant. She was attractive. She was smart. And as years rolled by, I had heard that Suzie might have a cocaine problem. I did not know. But I do know this: over a year ago, or maybe it was 2 years ago now, there was a major meth bust in our region, and it was proven that she was one of the kingpins. She was the person who was buying the material, a lot of the material to make methamphetamines, at the hardware store: lye, paint thinners, a lot of chemicals that one would not think have anything to do with ingesting in one's body. In fact, in my region the drug stores have all the Sudafed-type health medicines behind the pharmacy because they do not allow them out there because they are being purchased by people who come in time and time again and get them because that is a main ingredient to make meth. So it shows us the problem is rampant. It took 4 years to get the kingpin. DEA, the State drug team, the local police worked 4 years to get the person. And Suzie was the person who helped them nail him because before they never could get the kingpin. And he is now in prison, I think, for 40 or 45 years. But residue is he has taught so many people how to make high-quality meth that we remain a meth production area. And the police tell me they just do not know how to get their arms around it because every time they turn around, they hear another lead, they go check, they find another meth lab. I mean, they are everywhere.

So that is a story of a destroyed life. The final page on Suzie is I got to know her pretty well because she was volunteering in the nursing homes and the personal care homes and my moth-

er was there, and she was always very nice to my mother and we talked a bit. And I always wanted to sit down with her and talk with her about how it happened because she was going out also speaking to school groups. Several months ago on a Sunday morning, after friends had talked to her on Saturday night and she was in good spirits, she was found hanging in an old pump house in the woods, dead. Suzie lost her life because we heard, the kingpin said, and I do not know if they can ever prove it, but the kingpin said she will not live long. Suzie did not live long. She was a person in her late 40s. She was a mature woman. She was attractive. She was smart. But she got hooked on drugs. And if a person her age can get hooked, how vulnerable are our eighth, ninth and tenth graders as they are still growing and working to become adults? And that is why drug testing is so important. It is about protecting kids, not about penalizing kids.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and this is not a matter of condemning Americans. It is a matter of trying to develop a fully holistic policy to try to reduce drug and alcohol abuse. The fact is the President of the United States in his amazing address last night again acknowledged he overcame his addiction, or at least overuse of alcohol. One of my favorite commentators, Rush Limbaugh, had to battle with an addiction with OxyContin. Clearly, it strikes all types of people. It is not just the stereotypical people. And we need to reach out to people who are hurting and try to help them recover. We need to make sure that part of that is eliminating the temptation as much as possible, trying to keep the prices high enough, the supply low enough. We need to try to make sure there is an accountability on the dealers and those who are using it so they know if they want public money, whether it is if they are going to a public school, that there is going to be an accountability and somebody watching them for their own good and that there is also going to be help there in treatment and follow-up if they need it. Does the gentleman from California want to make a comment?

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I do have some disagreements with the gentleman as to the best way to attack this problem, but I certainly agree that we should make sure that young people understand just how serious the problem is for them and that there would be no greater method of telling them and putting a stamp of disapproval on it than making sure they have to have a drug test.

But the gentleman referred to on the chart there some of the decrease in drug use that we have had over the last 2 years, and I think that a lot of that can be attributed also to a stamp of disapproval that the young people understand that our society has given just in the last few years. In the last administration, I think that it could be

accurately said that people who were out fighting this problem were faced by an administration that trivialized the use of drugs as to what kind of threat it was when the President talked about not inhaling and such. And some of us who have had pretty wild youths in our time looked at that and said this man is not being serious, and the young people looked at the President and said this is not being serious, and our administration's seriousness on this has had a lot to do with the reduction in the use of drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, last night the President highlighted the success of our Nation's drug strategy. I applaud the President for the success of his strategy and for highlighting this issue in the State of the Union Address. Across the Nation, the latest study found there has been an 11-percent decline in drug use by 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students over the past 2 years. This finding translates into 400,000 fewer teens using drugs and is the first real decline nationally in 12 years. Our own local survey done by the Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati has shown similar results over the past 3 or 4 years. This is very encouraging news for parents, teenagers, teachers and everyone else who cares about the welfare of kids.

As the President mentioned last night, community involvement is critical to successful drug prevention. Community coalitions are the heart and soul of drug prevention and community action on this important topic. Coalitions help all of us to come together—parents, teachers, coaches, religious leaders, volunteers, law enforcement—to encourage youth to understand that any drug use is not only unacceptable but harmful. Having fewer youths use drugs is important because we know that if young people can abstain from drugs before they graduate from high school, they are much less likely to have drug problems later.

The Drug-Free Communities Act is an essential tool that many of our communities utilize to fight illegal drug abuse. Instead of creating new Federal bureaucracies, this program sends Federal money directly to local coalitions working to reduce the demand for drugs through effective education and prevention. Community coalitions are groups of citizens—parents, youths, business, media, law enforcement, religious organizations, civic groups, health care professionals, and others—who are working on local initiatives to reduce and prevent substance abuse. These coalitions are engaged in a wide variety of activities and strategies specifically tailored to the needs of their communities.

We know that coalitions are making a difference. Due to the great work of the Coalition for Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati, there was a 41-percent decrease in marijuana use and 23-percent decrease in alcohol use among 7th graders from 1993 to 2000. In a similar region where a coalition did not exist, there was a 33-percent increase in marijuana use and no change in alcohol use. The coalition, which I founded 8 years ago, is a comprehensive, long-term effort to mobilize every sector of the Greater Cincinnati community to take an active role in preventing substance abuse. It brings local community organizations

together with business leaders, parents, teens, clergy, law enforcement, and school officials to implement antidrug initiatives, and has become a model for dozens of communities nationwide. I know that there are similar coalitions in more than 5,000 communities nationwide doing this good work and they need our support.

The positive results highlighted today indicate that prevention tools like community coalitions work to create safe neighborhoods and a better future for our young people.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1545

PROVIDING HEALTH CARE FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues for that last special order, for the way that we are going to make sure that the young people in this country understand that drugs pose a threat to them is to have just this type of presentation in Congress and this type of discussion, serious discussion, with them as to the threat that drugs pose to their well-being.

With that, however, I would like to now, in my hour, raise a discussion on another issue that I believe is perhaps the most serious threat to the well-being of the American people. I have introduced a bill today that will give my colleagues a stark choice. They can do what will help big business, but will, at the same time, do great damage to the American people as a whole; or they can support the legislation that I am proposing, which will be a big step toward eliminating the greatest threat to the well-being of the American people.

Drugs is certainly a threat, but I will tell you that I believe the greatest threat to the American people as we stand here today is the still uncontrolled flood of illegal immigration into our society. All the other problems that we have, including drug use in our own country, are exacerbated by this uncontrolled flow of illegal immigrants into the United States of America. If we do not get control of this, it will surely destroy our country as we know it in the years ahead.

Yes, we can absorb legal immigrants in a fairly high number. I am proud

that we have a little more than 1 million legal immigrants coming into our country every year, one-half of one percent of growth or so of our population. Certainly we can absorb that kind of immigration flow. But what we have had in these last 15 years, and especially in the last 10 years, is a massive increase in the flow of illegal immigrants into our country.

Perhaps it can be traced back to the 1986 amnesty bill that passed through this Congress and was signed into law, unfortunately, by my President, President Ronald Reagan. That bill was hard-fought on this House floor, and I understand that my colleague, Mr. Dan Lundgren, is the father of that portion of the bill that insisted on amnesty for those illegal immigrants that were already in the country.

Once that amnesty took place, once this legislation was passed in 1986, the word went out throughout the whole world that if you get to the United States, you are going to get the benefits of the people of the United States, and you can outwait the American people because we have such good hearts that there will be another amnesty, and yet another. The flow of illegal immigration after 1986, instead of decreasing, dramatically increased. Surprise, surprise.

No, the people who passed that need to take responsibility for their actions. That piece of legislation has caused great damage to us. In California, our schools, the education system, is under incredible pressure. Our criminal justice system is almost breaking down under the weight of illegal immigrants, with 30 and 40 percent of those who are held in incarceration at times being illegal immigrants. Our healthcare system, our emergency rooms are breaking down under the pressure and the strain of illegal immigrants. And that is what leads me to the legislation which I introduced today.

This legislation that I introduced today flows directly from a confrontation that I had with the leaders of this body over whether a provision should have been included in the Medicare reform bill that provided \$1 billion in order to pay for the emergency healthcare for illegal immigrants in those States where illegal immigration is most prevalent.

I opposed that and I was not going to vote for the Medicare bill because of that, but the leadership in the House agreed that if I would vote for the Medicare bill, that I could write legislation that would, in some way, mitigate the damage that I felt was inherent in providing U.S. tax dollars officially to pay for services, health services, for people who have come to this country or are currently in this country illegally.

I voted for the Medicare bill. I voted for it before it went to the Senate. When it came back from the Senate I only voted for it with this understanding. So today the bill that I place into the hopper is in direct relationship

to the Medicare bill that passed through this House, that, yes, indeed, took care of the prescription drug needs of many of our seniors, but, at the same time, did include an extraneous provision for providing \$1 billion in healthcare for illegal immigrants.

With that, I would say that the hospitals and emergency rooms on our Nation's borders, especially those in California, are certainly now going broke trying to treat illegal aliens who are streaming into their facilities. And there is no doubt about this pressure. There is no doubt about the horrible impact that it is having.

But the reasons are twofold for the pressure on these hospitals and emergency rooms. Illegal aliens, first of all, normally, or at least quite often, if not normally, we do not have the exact statistics because they are operating in a black area of our society, we do not know all of the statistics about what illegal aliens have or do not have, we assume they are normally working at jobs with no healthcare benefits. Couple that with the fact that Congress insists and the law now insists that hospital emergency rooms treat every patient who walks through those doors of their emergency room, that they must be treated according to law.

America, with those two realities facing us, number one, that people who come here illegally generally are working at jobs without healthcare benefits, meaning the people who run the businesses do not provide them healthcare, but the taxpayers end up providing the health care, coupled with the fact that the emergency rooms feel that they are required by law to take care of anyone who walks through the door, what we have done is created a situation where America has now become the HMO to the whole world.

We are taking care of illegal immigrants, any illegal immigrant, who can get to our country and get to that emergency room. Sometimes we are not talking about just emergency treatment, about what common sense would tell us is emergency treatment; we are talking about extended cancer treatments, we are talking about treatments for diseases that are congenital, we are talking about diseases that someone clearly had when they came to the United States. We are talking about diseases that require hundreds of thousands of dollars, and sometimes even up to \$1 million, in treatment.

With this Medicare bill that we provided, \$1 billion for the emergency healthcare for illegal immigrants, that is the first time any money has been spent to provide services for illegal immigrants in our country, so this is a watershed. This is that moment.

In doing that, did that same bill try to fix the situation by enforcing our immigration laws on the border and insisting that these immigration laws be enforced if we provide that \$1 billion? No, that was not in the bill. Did Congress try to fix the situation by saying that emergency rooms can turn away

patients who are not in immediate danger of dying? To me that seems what an emergency is. An emergency is if someone is in immediate danger of dying, or if they are in immediate danger of something happening that will at that moment create a circumstance in their life or create something that is irreversible, a health reality in their life that is irreversible.

But, no, we did not put any restrictions on the emergency care rooms turning away patients because they really were not in emergencies, or just treating a case to a small degree until those people could go back to their own countries and get the rest of the treatment needed to become well. No, none of this was included in that Medicare bill. But \$1 billion was.

The bill included no provisions to lower the cost of caring for illegal aliens by enforcing the law and deporting them. After all, if the taxpayers and the American people are going to end up paying for the healthcare of someone who has come into this country illegally, just ignored our laws or thumbed their noses at our laws, and now they are in need of some health treatment and they come to us asking us to take money out of our pocket, those people, if they are here illegally, after they are treated, at the very least, they should be deported.

That was not in that legislation either. The bill added \$1 billion of funding for the healthcare of illegal aliens and did not even ask the hospitals to identify the illegal aliens they are treating, to identify them so that INS could deport them or take some action against them for being in our country illegally.

It did not do any of those things. What it did do is begin the process of shoveling tax dollars in the direction of providing services, officially providing services for people who are in this country illegally.

I will tell you now, there is no one in this body that does not know and understand that a \$1 billion program like this starting off, just opening the door, is going to end up being a \$50 billion program 10 years down the line. So it is time for us to act right now, before this \$1 billion becomes \$4 billion, which then becomes \$10 billion, which then becomes \$20 billion. It is time for us to use this moment, this opportunity, with the passage of the Medicare bill, to support legislation in the Congress that will at least be a first big step toward trying to see if we can get this illegal immigration issue under control, at least in the area of healthcare.

What I am proposing is very simple. The legislation that I just dropped into the hopper is not so complicated that people cannot understand it. First of all, it is totally voluntary. A hospital that does not want to receive Federal money under the program in that Medicare bill does not have to participate in this. So that is the first principle.

I would prefer that we make it mandatory, but this legislation is going

way over to the other side in order to reach out and make this reasonable by saying if you are not going to get the Federal money for the illegals, if you are not going to apply for that, then what is required in this bill will not be required of you. But for the hospitals who do want that Federal funding, the bill is very easy to understand for these hospitals that want that Federal funding.

The hospital needs to ask patients if they are a citizen of the United States. How about that? How about that? They are going to have to ask, when they ask all those other questions when you go into that emergency room, they just have to ask are you a citizen of the United States? If the patient says yes, no further action is required of the hospital in terms of verifying whether that person is a citizen.

By the way, others can follow up on that. Others can follow up later to see if this person is or is not a citizen.

But if the patient says no, and he or she is not a citizen, the hospital then is required to ask what country the patient is from and what is their immigration status. If the patient is a documented alien, meaning that patient is here legally and is a legal immigrant, nothing needs more to be done, because nothing that I am proposing and our outrage about illegal immigration is not in any way an attack on legal immigrants. People who have come to this country legally have every right of every other citizen, and I know a lot of people now are trying to blur the difference between illegals and legal. That is doing a great disservice to the legal immigrants in our country. Most legal immigrants, I might add, are outraged by illegal immigration and by the fact that we provide services to illegal immigrants.

□ 1600

In fact, sometimes the legal immigrants and U.S. citizens end up having less bestowed upon them by our government than do the illegal immigrants. A U.S. citizen, for example, has to pay outside tuition in California to go to a junior college, but an illegal immigrant does not have to pay outside tuition. That was something that was passed by the California legislature.

If the alien is illegal, once he comes into the hospital, going back to this emergency room treatment, if the alien is illegal, the hospital must ask about the immigrant's employer and a biometric indicator, meaning a photo or a fingerprint, must be taken, to be determined by the Department of Homeland Security of whether it should be a thumb print or a picture; but that is what they have to do if this person who comes into the emergency room is an illegal immigrant and states for the record that he is an illegal immigrant. So we need to know who they are working for, and we need to know exactly what country they came from and get a fingerprint or a picture.

The hospital then uploads this information into a database that is now being set up by the Department of Health and Human Services and, of course, the Department of Homeland Security. Thus the information that we have collected will become available to the Department of Homeland Security and these other government agencies for national security purposes and, yes, for the purposes of immigration enforcement. There is nothing that would suggest that that information could not be used to immediately begin deportation proceedings against an illegal immigrant who is coming into our hospitals to get thousands of dollars, if not tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars of free medical care from the taxpayers of the United States.

Thus we have the information available that is not now available if my bill passes. And at that point, I would hope that our Immigration and Naturalization Service and this administration and the people of the United States begin to demand that people who are in this country illegally be deported, especially if they have used tens of thousands and millions of dollars of public services like health care while they are here, because what they have done is taken that money directly from the well-being of the American people, their host.

This is wrong. It is wrong for us to permit our health care dollars that our seniors do not even get the type of coverage that we would like them to have, our veterans do not get the coverage we would like them to have; but yet we permit illegal immigrants to come into our emergency rooms, and without even any responsibility to be deported because they have come here illegally, they end up, oftentimes consuming, as I say, tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of dollars of treatment.

This procedure of just asking are they legal or illegal and if they are illegal, getting this information, is not a burden on the hospital. It is just a couple of more questions to be asked routinely in the process in which they are already being asked questions before they treat patients. Once the hospital determines that a patient is undocumented, they take a simple fingerprint or a photo and then they just upload this information onto a government database. That is it. This is not a complicated process, although we are going to hear in the months ahead how horribly complicated it is and how people will have to wait there for hours to be treated and they will die by the thousands if they are just asked to do those two simple little tasks, along with the other questions that they ask people when they go into an emergency room.

Well, so far, my bill, what I am talking about, is very simple for the hospitals to comply with. But let me note there are some other significant provisions of this bill. The first is, the Department of Homeland Security, when it gets this information, the bill does

suggest that they should begin deportation proceedings. And as I say, that will only happen if we make sure, because it is already on the books that someone who is here illegally, there should be deportation proceedings, but that law is not being enforced. We add this to the law again, and we hope and we pray that those people who are in decision-making positions in our government will start enforcing the law or change the law. But the way it is now, to permit this massive flow of illegal immigration into our country and the flagrant violation of the law that is going on, it degrades the respect for the law throughout our society.

So this is only common sense, that if we know that an illegal alien is in the United States, especially one that is consuming resources that are taking health care resources away from our people, they should be deported; and their own country should be taking care of them.

Secondly, and this is a provision of the bill, any employer, when they find out who the employer is, that is one of the questions they have to ask. Any employer who has not called the employment verification program, and again, this is going to be a nationwide program that will be in place in 2005, a program that will verify an employee's legal status, if any employer whose employee has gone into the emergency room and been treated and thus consumed all sorts of tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of dollars, then if we find out that the employer has not called the employment verification program when he hired this illegal in the first place, well then, that employer will be liable for the illegal alien's emergency room costs.

We have businessmen who now exploit illegal aliens in order to give them a pittance of pay and no benefits. These employers, if they are not giving them benefits, they expect the taxpayers to pick up the health care costs. I am sorry, under this bill that is going to go back to the employers. The employers, if they are going to get the benefit of using these illegals, they are going to have to pay at least for their health care and not expect the U.S. citizens, their fellow U.S. citizens to pick up the cost, their cost of hiring this employee. So this is only fair.

Employers claim that American citizens, of course, will not take the jobs that illegal immigrants take. But of course they will not take the jobs, especially if employers are not going to provide health insurance. If you are not providing health insurance, it is pretty hard to attract qualified American job seekers, and no businesses will be providing health care insurance for Americans if they can hire illegals and the taxpayers end up picking up their health care costs. This has been an incentive, illegal immigration has been an incentive for less wages and for less benefits, for the fact that a lot of employers do not offer health care anymore; and that can be tied directly

back to the fact that we have a flow of millions and millions of illegals who are willing to work without health care benefits; and, of course, everybody is relying on the taxpayers just to pick up the bill. This lack of health insurance ends up putting the burden of an illegal alien's health care on the shoulders of the American taxpayer. That is wrong and we have to change that. This bill will change that.

I might add that this provision will initiate an eruption of opposition to this bill specifically for that, because we have had big business in this country who has gotten used to having the taxpayers pick up the health care costs that they should be providing their own employees, and they have been able to attract employees by hiring illegal immigrants. It keeps down wages and keeps down benefits.

Employers should pay the full cost for the illegal alien labor that they hire, including health care costs of illegal aliens that they run up in emergency rooms. And this is not, I would say, a huge burden on employers, although they are going to claim this. All we are talking about is that when an illegal alien or someone comes to them, whether it is apparent they are an illegal alien or not, comes to them for employment, that one of the things they do when filling out the paperwork for this new employee is call one phone number, one phone call to a Federal agency, make one check on the name of this potential employee, and if they do that and check and find out that this person is here legally, they have indemnified themselves from this liability and they will not have to then pay for that emergency room care. But if they do not even make that one phone call, why should we taxpayers pick up the bill? These employers obviously are trying not to verify that someone they are hiring is illegal, and then they are not giving them health care and we pick up the costs. Where does that come from? Right out of the same pot of money that takes care of our seniors, our own veterans, our own women and children in the United States of America. There is a limited amount of health care dollars. We should be spending it on our legal residents, whether they are legal immigrants and/or U.S. citizens.

So, anyway, I do not see how any employer can possibly object to just taking one step, a very quick step, to see if their future employee is here legally or not.

Third in the bill, and this is a very important factor in this bill, this bill does something that is important to the whole formula in that it limits the emergency care that a hospital is required to give. Because right now what we have is an illegal alien comes in, any type of health care that is required that is an emergency, that is deemed to be an emergency, we end up giving extensive health care way beyond just someone's life or death situation or someone's situation where their health

status would be altered forever if a treatment is not given at that moment. No. We go way beyond that so often. What we suggest is the hospital is required to give just the care that is required to medically stabilize the illegal alien's condition, and it would stabilize them to the point that they can be deported back to their home country.

Now, we have seen, as I just said, we have seen illegal aliens obtaining organ transplants, advanced cancer treatments. There was a fellow in my district from El Salvador, it must have been about 10 years ago now, and this man had had \$300,000 worth of cancer treatments. He was not a citizen; he was not even a legal immigrant. He was an illegal immigrant, and we had spent \$300,000 on this man. That is a crime. If someone goes in and steals \$100 from a grocery store, they are going to go to jail. Yet we permit people to illegally come into this country and take hundreds of thousands of dollars of treatment. The American taxpayer, as I say, cannot be the world's HMO. It is going to break us. It is already affecting the health care available to our own citizens in a very detrimental way.

Again, let me repeat: the American taxpayer cannot be the world's HMO. An illegal alien should be transported back to his or her country to receive any extraordinary care. Emergency care should only be for the temporary emergency where life is threatened at that moment. It is emphatically the responsibility of the illegal alien's own country to care for him; it is not the responsibility of the taxpayers of the United States or the Treasury of the United States Government. The foreign countries who our illegal aliens are coming from need to take care of their own citizens, not export their problem to the United States.

Let us note now for the record there are many, many incidences of people coming here specifically to get health care treatments. They come here and they are on a visa or something like that. That has got to stop, and especially if they have come here illegally and expect to get those same kinds of health care treatments. It is wrong. We should not do that, and it is hurting the well-being of our people.

Now, we are going to hear about how mean spirited it is to enforce our immigration laws and how mean spirited this proposal is. This bill will probably just generate the most incredible opposition and people pulling their hair out and saying how horrible we are. The motive behind this bill is a positive motive, and there is nothing wrong with loving your family and taking care of your family and taking care of the citizens of the United States and those people who are here legally. There is nothing wrong with having that motive.

□ 1615

But our motives will be attacked as if we hate other people from other

countries. And they will try to blur the difference between illegal immigrants and legal immigrants. No, this bill is motivated out of love. And certainly and there is nothing wrong with anyone taking care of his family rather than giving money away to the point that his own family's health is not being taken care of.

And the fact is that some people are saying now, well, we cannot afford not to have these illegals around because we are used to cheap labor, as if cheap labor is something that is good for the American people. Well, as health care costs show, that labor really is not all that cheap when you include all the costs.

Illegal immigrant labor, there are lots of costs related to it that we are picking up as taxpayers that the businessman does not have to shoulder. Big business has shown that they are not interested in paying American wages and giving benefits to their workers if they can get away with hiring illegals who will work for lower wages. What big business wants is a huge pool of international labor so that corporations can force down wages.

Illegal immigration is having a horrible impact on all these government services that I am talking about, especially the health care. The legislation that I introduced today specifically deals with that. But let us note that the wages of all Americans are being affected and the benefits being offered to all Americans by their employers are being affected by illegal immigration. American workers, no matter how competitive, cannot compete with Chinese slave labor or a Nigerian standard of living.

Huge corporations then are using the poor and desperate of the world because we are not enforcing our immigration laws to force the American middle-class to accept poverty as a price of holding a job. Well, we hear time and time again, well, Americans will not work for these lowly paid jobs. Well, that is nonsense. There are no jobs that Americans will not do. There are no jobs. I can repeat that. There is no job that an American will not do but there are lots of jobs that Americans will not do at the wages that are being offered for those jobs.

The answer to the labor shortage is not to import poor people from Bangladesh or to permit a flood of illegal immigrants into our country, but instead to raise the wages and benefits of the U.S. working people. We have a lot of people in this country who can work who are not going to work at those wages certainly because those are poverty wages. We have got a lot of businesses who will hire illegals now rather than hiring a person who is disabled and training that disabled American, that disabled veteran, perhaps, to do a job that can be beneficial to the country and he or she can earn his or her own way but the business will not do it. Instead they will they will hire an illegal immigrant who will work for

half the price and does not require any special training because of a disability. And then if there is a disability on the job, the employer just waves good-bye and the taxpayers pick up all the costs.

The National Research Council in 1997 did a study showing immigration was responsible for a 44 percent drop in the wages for our people in the United States who were high school dropouts. Look, I do not like that some of our people are high school dropouts. I am sorry some of our people are at that lower end of the income level. But those are the people who are being hurt the most by illegal immigration.

The average immigrant has less than a high school education and so this makes perfect sense. It is Economics 101. If you increase the labor supply at that level where you have illegal immigrants coming in here who have less than a high school education and they are competing with our people who have less than a high school education, or are less educated people at the lower income of our country, guess what? If you increase the supply of that those people coming in, the wages will drop for those people who are already here, meaning our own people, legal immigrants and American citizens.

This has meant misery in many blue collar households who actually in this last 15 years since this 1986 amnesty they have seen their wages drop and their standard of living decrease because we have been insisting on importing uneducated illegal immigrants, or at least insisting that the flood of illegal immigrants coming into our country not be stopped. This has hurt millions of our own people, people who maybe now have been working at a higher standard of living but are not now working at a higher standard of living because illegals have taken that job at a lower wage and kept the wages down.

A good example of that is perhaps in my own case. When I was younger I worked as a janitor. The people who work as janitors today have perhaps the same income about the same level of income as I had when I worked as a janitor 30 years ago. I guess it might have been more than 30 years ago now, more like 40 years ago. Well, guess what? We have had an enormous increase in our standard of living in the GNP in those 40 years. Why should janitors not be making more money? Well, I will tell you why. Because if they would have not had a flood of illegal immigrants, you would have had machines and technology that would have been developed making that janitor much more efficient. Maybe he could clean 30 toilets or 100 toilets a night instead of 15 or 20. And that man could or woman could have been paid more money as a janitor. But instead what we have hired is illegals. And there has been no technology development that would make up for that.

And thus we have kept the wages of janitors down, those janitors should be American citizens earning a wage that

would permit them to buy their own home, or at least to live at a decent standard of living. Instead we have a flood of illegals in and those people are not living well now because they are having to compete with people who have come here, the poorest of the poor from everywhere. That is not fair to the American people who shoulder the burdens of freedom all over the world and shoulder the burdens of keeping our country the way it is. And they are hurting because of this flow of illegal immigration. The same National Research Council showed that the average immigrant household in California used \$3,463 in taxpayer services. That is back in 1997.

If you were looking for why California has such a huge deficit, that is, and have a deficit bigger than all other 50 states combined, illegal immigration is probably the answer. This taxpayer funded largesse includes in California health care, education, police services.

And let us talk a little bit about the cost for each of these services. The American Hospital Association reported that its member facilities provided \$21 billion in uncompensated health care services last year. Since illegal aliens accounted for 43 percent of those without health insurance in the country, we can assume that at least \$9 billion of that total is attributable to illegal aliens. \$9 billion. That is what business is calling cheap labor? This is cheap labor, \$9 billion of costs added on to the American taxpayers?

All along the border from Texas to California dozens of hospitals have closed their emergency rooms because they can no longer survive the financial hemorrhaging caused by giving free health care to illegals. And do not underestimate the drawing power of free care. This brings people across our borders. Remember Jessica Santillian, an illegal alien who died after receiving not one but two heart transplants and a lung transplant in North Carolina. The Santillian family paid \$5,000 to be smuggled across the border to get care knowing that it would take years to get any type of operation at all if they stayed in Mexico. There are American citizens who desperately need organs. They are being knocked out of line by a family and by families who break our law.

Then many of these families are coming here specifically to obtain a transplant or to obtain some sort of sophisticated health operation. This is a crime against our own citizens when we let that happen. It is not that we do not like that poor family in Mexico but we need to make sure that we keep the promise to our own citizens first before we expend our resources to those who have come here illegally from another country. And then, of course, the other country does not have the incentive to use their resources to build up their health care for their own people.

What about the children of illegal aliens? The total K-12 school expenditure for illegal immigrants cost the

States \$7.4 billion annually. That is enough to buy a computer for every American student, America's junior high schools.

Are you worried about school overcrowding? Hear anybody talk about overcrowding? You hear about that all the time. If the left wing teachers unions were not so allied with this cause of the illegal immigrants, we would find out exactly what is causing the crowding.

Let me note this, and this is a very incredible statement, without school-age illegal immigrants, the children that we are talking about, the children of illegal immigrants, school enrollment would not have risen at all during the past decade. Let me repeat that. School enrollment would have remained flat if it was not for unrestricted illegal immigration into our country.

So when one hears them talking about crowded schools, the answer is not to just spend more and more resources taking it away, again, from the other things that we need in our society in order to provide this service for illegal immigrants which then attracts even more illegal immigrants who care about their families and want their families to get this same largesse so they come here in even greater numbers.

But by far, the most disturbing is the impact illegal immigration is having on crime in California. In Los Angeles, 95 percent of all outstanding warrants for homicide involve illegal aliens. Do you get that? In Los Angeles, 95 percent of all outstanding warrants for homicide involve illegal aliens. And up to two-thirds of all fugitive felony warrants are for illegal aliens. Illegal aliens commit crimes in the United States and then they flee the country.

Oh, as an aside, in California we have a particular problem, some of those flee to Mexico. And even when the criminal alien is known and their whereabouts are known to Mexico, the Mexican courts refuse to extradite them. By far the most outrageous case was that of David March, a Los Angeles County sheriff who was gunned down by an illegal alien who fled to Mexico and then only to have Mexico refuse to extradite a man who had blatantly murdered a police officer in California.

Almost 30 percent of Federal prisoners are now foreign born; 36 percent of illegal alien criminals are released from Federal prison; 36 percent of illegal alien criminals were released from Federal and several state prisons with no deportation review. You get this? Thirty-six percent of those illegal aliens in our prisons and jails get out with no review as if they should be deported. But yet they are here illegally; 80 of these illegal alien criminals have been arrested for new crimes.

Now, stop for just a minute and think about this: It is not just the cost of incarcerating illegal aliens, expensive as that is, which is \$22,500 a year, for hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens.

What is the cost to the American taxpayer of all of this? That \$22,000, yeah, that is to the taxpayer, but what about their theft of property? What about the murders, the rapes and the assaults perpetrated by these criminals who come here illegally? And our government is so ineffective and so captive to corporate interests that we have permitted this massive flow of illegal immigration that is keeping down the wages of our people and is resulting in hardship and resulting in people suffering throughout our country. We do not even deport these criminals. When they are criminals we do not deport them when they get out of jail. These are not simple illegal aliens looking for a better life when they get out of jail, these are hardened criminals, many of them with ties to vicious drug gangs and violent criminal cartels and they are not deported? What is going on here?

And our system, rather than allowing a swift and certain deportation, in many cases simply released these predators into the American population so they can rub elbows with our families at the movie theater.

My friends, there is nothing conservative about a policy that has permitted this type of illegal immigration into our society with these horrific consequences to the American people.

But even more worrying are the implications in our war against terror. Several drug cartels are getting into the illegal alien smuggling business. The cartels will help smuggle anyone into the United States who pays. These vicious organizations have no hesitation about smuggling terrorists into the United States. And once in the United States, terrorists simply disappear into the huge sea of other illegal aliens.

□ 1630

Do we need this cheap labor that we are talking about? Is it really cheap labor?

I am telling you that the cost is too high. The price of overcrowding of schools, the price of collapsing emergency rooms, the rise of vicious crimes in our society, the holding down of the wages of our people, our working people, this is wrong. This is a price that we are paying. Our people should not be forced to pay this price simply because our government is not enforcing the law. But more importantly, is the United States willing to go the way of South America?

What kind of country are we producing when we permit millions of people to flood into our country every year? What is going to happen? And we keep wages down for our own people. We are creating a society with a wealthy privileged few on top and a huge class underneath who are barely surviving? Why are we doing this? Why are we permitting our country to be restructured where we have opportunity for all and our systems are working that can provide health and services

and education services to our people? Why are we doing that?

Because America's big companies want a huge pool of cheap labor to drive down American labor costs to the level of China and Latin America and because the left wing of the Democratic Party wants to use illegal immigrants as a weapon for political power. That is it. The unholy alliance between the left wing of the Democratic Party and the big business wing of the Republican Party. I am sorry. That is clear.

Those of us who represent neither of those groups should start getting together and making sure we solve this problem.

These corporations that I am talking about have no stake in this country. Many of these great big corporations want to keep our labor. They go overseas the first time they can. They end up investing in Communist China, the world's worst human rights abuser. They are setting up factories in Vietnam. Then they insult our intelligence as well by asking us to give them an export-import bank guarantee on their loans so that when they set up these manufacturing companies overseas, the taxpayers will guarantee them. So they can set up the manufacturing there and use the cheap labor in order to put our people out of business. Our people get out of those manufacturing jobs and what happens? They end up competing with guess what here at home? A flood of illegal immigrants who are willing to do their job cheaper and they end up being unemployed.

What heartache, what misery this causes so many families in the United States of America. We are talking about alcoholism and drug use and family abuse. This is caused by the type of tensions by people who cannot get the jobs that their fathers and mothers had years ago, and they cannot be expected now to ever buy a new home or a new car. They are always worried a tire might go out because they cannot afford to fix the tire.

This is what we have relegated half of the American people to. It is wrong. Now do not get me wrong. I am for capitalism. I am for free enterprise. I am actually for free trade in a way because I believe in free trade between free people. I do not think our government should be promoting free trade and subsidizing our people going overseas to any country. Certainly, we should not be talking about developing the economies of China and other dictatorships; but I do not see anything wrong in trading with Australia and other free countries.

Also, this is not capitalism that we are talking about. I am for free trade and I am for free enterprise, but free enterprise does not mean that you artificially import labor into your country to keep labor costs low. That is ridiculous; that is not part of the free enterprise system.

The working people of this country are willing to fight and die to preserve the freedom of this country in order to

be confronted with the idea that their wages are going to be kept down by a flood of illegals coming into our country and an unwillingness to enforce the immigration laws. That is absolutely wrong. That is absolutely wrong.

Democracies cannot survive without an educated middle class. And illegal immigration is destroying the viability of the American middle class. Our Founding Fathers envisioned a middle class of small tradesmen, of farmers who would have an education and the ability to govern themselves and to be independent factors in our economy. In fact, as we have seen over and over, a huge mass of desperate and poor and poorly educated people will quite often turn to the siren song of communism under certain circumstances like that where there is no hope.

We are creating an underclass in America, a permanent underclass of illegals and of our own people. These people, when they get desperate, they listen to the rantings and raving of communism or the bellicose musings of fascism. Democracy is based on a well-educated and prosperous middle class. It has been America's greatest strength. To preserve this Republic, to protect the American middle class, we must stop the importation of cheap labor. We must stop the fact that we have a massive flow of illegals into this country. We keep the wages down and distort the progress that would be coming to the people on the lower levels of our economic tier here in our country.

Instead, the people in the lower levels of our economy are not rising. Their incomes are going down. Their expectations are going down. Their frustrations are going up. And they do not know why, but they do know that all the jobs are taken by people who are working for dirt wages and that their fathers had better jobs at better pay that were meaningful jobs.

Now, where do we start to turn this around? We can start by getting control of the health care that we provide those who come into this country illegally. At the very least let us stop right now. We have started a program, the first time that our country is spending any money officially to provide a service for people who are here illegally. That Medicare bill provides \$1 billion for illegal alien health care services. It will be \$50 billion 10 years from now if we do not do anything about it.

So let us do something about it now. Let us start turning the situation around now by focusing on this legislation that I drop today that will mitigate any bad impact of providing this billion dollars for emergency health care for illegals by making sure that we have these provisions, these provisions that will see that they are identified, their employers, identified, that a deportation proceeding moves forward if they are treated, and that the amount of treatment that they can receive when they are here illegally is limited to a life-threatening situation

rather than providing extensive care for diseases that are not a crisis at that moment. We can start turning it around right now.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in this vital legislation to limit the health care to illegal aliens so that we can have that money available to the American people. I am going to be vilified for this. I know that. I had all sorts of press calls and everything after the leadership made the agreement with me to have this bill come to the floor. I know I am going to be vilified. I know people are going to say I am a mean, nasty person and that I do not care and that I am a racist or something like that. I am not and I have love in my heart for everybody.

I know that even the people who come here illegally are wonderful people, 90 percent of them are wonderful people. They just want to increase their own standard of living, a way to treat their family decently. But we cannot do this for the entire world. We cannot expect to see our own people suffer and to try to equalize them to every poor person in the world, and this will bring more and more people here. And if we care and we have love for our families, having love for your family and having love for the legal immigrants and the legal U.S. citizens that are here, that love for those people does not mean you hate someone else. That means you care for your family and you will take care of them first. That is what care means.

So I would ask the people who are reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and my colleagues to look at this legislation. Let us turn the situation around now. Let us speak out. Let us make sure that we stand up for what America is supposed to be for. It is a land of opportunity, yes; but it is a land where one thing ties us together. We are Americans and we come from every race, every religion, every ethnic group. Here we are. We have come from every country in the world, and we have a proud immigrant heritage; and we are not shutting that off. I am not suggesting that we cut off the legal flow of immigrants into our country and we do about a million a year, which is more than all the rest of the world combined.

So what we need to do is to make sure that we take the people who are here legally and people who are U.S. citizens and recognize who ties us together as a Nation. Other countries have their own religion. Other countries have a traditional ethnic group or a race that makes them what they were; but what ties Americans together is a love of liberty, of freedom, of justice, of people who come here to be part of this American Dream.

Well, if we do not care about each other, if that spirit of caring does not, we do not have an ethnic tie to keep us together. We do not have one religion because there are people of every religious state here in America. That one religion does not keep us together. It is

a love of liberty and justice and a commitment to opportunity and a caring for us all as all Americans as a family. We care about us.

What is the United States? United States. It is us. And just because we are saying that we are going to focus on caring about us does not mean that you have hatred in your heart towards someone else. And please, please open your hearts and open your consciences. Look at this issue, and I think you will see this is based on positive motives. We have to end the massive flow of illegal immigration into this country, or we will hurt the people that we care about. It will hurt us. It will hurt the United States if we continue down this path. The quickest way to turn it around is to start with this legislation, and it is going to be tough and there is going to be a lot of name calling; but I would ask you to join with me and let us save America and let us leave the other countries so they start providing a better life for their people overseas, rather than just trying to use us as an escape valve so they can send people who are dissatisfied here.

If we quit serving as that escape valve, they will have to have health care in Mexico and these other countries where they are coming here from overseas illegally. If we just keep taking people in, they will have lost their incentive.

So I ask my colleagues to look at this legislation. I thank you for providing this time.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Pursuant to section 491 of the Higher Education Act, the order of the House on December 8, 2003, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a 3-year term:

Mr. Robert Shireman, Oakland, California.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. DUNN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. HAYWORTH (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of traveling with the President.

Mr. PLATTS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARDIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KIRK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ISSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHUSTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 23, 2004, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6275. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for Fiscal Year 2003, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1145(e); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6276. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on International Relations.

6277. A letter from the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a year-end report on efforts in implementing Plan Colombia; to the Committee on International Relations.

6278. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2004-19 on Waiver of Restrictions on Assistance to the Republic of Uzbekistan under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993, and Title V of the FREEDOM Support Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

6279. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmit-

ting the Department's FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6280. A letter from the Director, Division for Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) (RIN: 3206-AK30) received January 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6281. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes: Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30397; Amdt. No. 445] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6282. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures: Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30392; Amdt. No. 3079] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6283. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures: Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30394; Amdt. No. 3081] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6284. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace: Clarion, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-15726; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-68] received December 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6285. A letter from the Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2003 Annual Report, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1308; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Government Reform, and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 3712. A bill to improve seaport security; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 3713. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 250 West Cherry Street in Carbondale, Illinois the "Senator Paul Simon Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3714. A bill to provide better protection against bovine spongiform encephalopathy and other prion diseases; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FROST, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 3715. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure

projects and new job creation through the establishment of a National Infrastructure Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Ms. HART):

H.R. 3716. A bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the provisions relating to countervailing duties apply to nonmarket economy countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BASS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BURR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. BONO, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 3717. A bill to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmission of obscene, indecent, and profane language; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODE:

H.R. 3718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow State government employers to contribute to section 403(b) pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 3719. A bill to prohibit, consistent with Roe v. Wade, the interference by the government with a woman's right to choose to bear a child or terminate a pregnancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 3720. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to local educational agencies and private schools to establish drug-free school demonstration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BOYD, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. CUBIN):

H.R. 3721. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to repeal the essential air service local participation program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3722. A bill to amend section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 to impose conditions on Federal reimbursement of emergency health services furnished to undocumented aliens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 3723. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8135 Forest Lane in Dallas, Texas, as the "Vaughn Gross Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. SIMMONS):

H.R. 3724. A bill to amend section 220 of the National Housing Act to make a technical correction to restore allowable increases in the maximum mortgage limits for FHA-insured mortgages for multifamily housing projects to cover increased costs of installing a solar energy system or residential energy conservation measures; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 3725. A bill to prohibit United States military assistance for Egypt and to express the sense of Congress that the amount of military assistance that would have been provided for Egypt for a fiscal year should be provided in the form of economic support fund assistance; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 3726. A bill to authorize the grant program under which the Secretary of Homeland Security makes discretionary grants for use in high-threat, high-density urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.J. Res. 86. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 495. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. VITTER):

H. Res. 496. A resolution commending the Louisiana State University Tigers football team for winning the 2003 Bowl Championship Series national championship game, and commending the Southern University Jaguars football team for winning the 2003 SBN Black College National Football Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H. Res. 497. A resolution commending the Wake Forest University Demon Deacons field hockey team for winning the 2003 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Field Hockey Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Res. 498. A resolution congratulating the Grand Valley State University Lakers football team for winning the 2003 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II Football National Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. REYES, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TURNER of Texas, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H. Res. 499. A resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President and those officials relating to the disclosure of the identity and employment of Ms. Valerie Plame; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, International Relations, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. AKIN, and Mrs. BONO):

H. Res. 500. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission should vigorously enforce indecency and profanity laws pursuant to the intent of Congress in order to protect children in the United States from indecent and profane programming on broadcast television and radio; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LANTOS introduced a bill (H.R. 3727) for the relief of Maria Del Refugio Plascencia and Alfredo Plascencia-Lopez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 31: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 58: Mr. PAYNE and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 290: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 327: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 331: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 375: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 394: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 434: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 466: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 476: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 502: Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 527: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 832: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 839: Mr. PITTS, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 852: Mr. HOLT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 857: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 876: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. JOHN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. WELLER, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 883: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 885: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 920: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 936: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 962: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 965: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 972: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1154: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1225: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1264: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1268: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1322: Mr. WEINER and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1336: Mr. CLAY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 1426: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1499: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 1532: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 1564: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 1563: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1582: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1608: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1639: Mr. OLVER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1746: Mr. SHERMAN and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1776: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1811: Mr. KIND, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1824: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1956: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1997: Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 2053: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 2060: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2133: Mr. SCHROCK and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2173: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOFFEL, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2176: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2263: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2318: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 2323: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 2403: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2404: Mr. GOODE, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2490: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2509: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 2519: Mr. CASE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 2527: Mr. WEINER and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 2568: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2625: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 2699: Mr. MOORE and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2760: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2768: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. REYES, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2797: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2809: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2810: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2900: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 2959: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 3058: Mr. TURNER of Ohio and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 3092: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3104: Mr. WOLF and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 3125: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 3139: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 3190: Mr. GINGREY and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 3193: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 3213: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3225: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 3242: Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3246: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3247: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 3277: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3281: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 3306: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 3313: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 3329: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 3350: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 3352: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 3389: Mr. MOORE.
 H.R. 3412: Mr. GOODE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 3425: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 3438: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WEINER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 3446: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. WEINER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WU, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIRK, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 3473: Mr. CAMP, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. PASTOR.
 H.R. 3484: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 3527: Mr. SHAW.
 H.R. 3545: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CASE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 3550: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 3561: Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H.R. 3574: Mr. BURR, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SHADEGG, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H.R. 3591: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 3599: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 3605: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 3619: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROY-

BAL-ALLARD, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 3642: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 3673: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 3676: Mr. OWENS and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 3684: Mr. FROST, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3687: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. FORD, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BURR, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. WICKER.
 H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
 H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. SOUDER.
 H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. KILDEE.
 H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 269: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H. Con. Res. 324: Mr. MATHESON and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H. Con. Res. 326: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. TANCREDO.
 H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H. Con. Res. 344: Mr. OWENS and Mr. WEXLER.
 H. Con. Res. 348: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FROST, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CANNON, Mr.

McNULTY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H. Res. 157: Mr. ALLEN.
 H. Res. 313: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. NADLER.
 H. Res. 402: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
 H. Res. 466: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. EHLERS.
 H. Res. 479: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. CLAY.
 H. Res. 481: Mr. BURNS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H. Res. 482: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FORD, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BARRATT of South Carolina, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. HILL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. TIBERI.
 H. Res. 489: Mr. HYDE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. STARK.
 H. Res. 490: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WU.
 H. Res. 492: Mr. RENZI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. TOOMEY.